THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

PARL. PAPERS
R REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK S.T. W.

616970

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

SIXTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

5 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXLII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIRST DAY OF MARCH TO THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF MARCH, 1905.

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION.

1905.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41 Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42 Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7 Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2 Will. IV.	1832
— 9 — 14	3 —	1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4 Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5 —	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6 Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7 —	1836
— 36 — 38	8 —	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 to 44... 1 Victoria 1838
— 45 — 50... 2 — 1839
— 51 — 55... 3 — 1840
— 56 — 58... 4 — (a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 59 .... 4 Victoria (b) 1841
— 60 to 65... 5 — 1842
— 66 — 71... 6 — 1843
— 72 — 76... 7 — 1844
— 77 — 82... 8 — 1845
— 83 — 88... 9 — 1846
— 89 — 94...10 — (a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 95 ... .10 Victoria (b) 1847
— 96 to 101...11 — 1848
— 102 —107...12 — 1849
— 108 —113...13 — 1850
— 114 —118...14 — 1851
— 119 —122...15 — (a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 123 ....15 Victoria (b) 1852
— 124 to 129...16 — 1853
— 130 —135...17 — 1854
— 136 —139...18 — 1855
— 140 —143...19 — 1856
— 144 ....20 — (a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol. 145 to 147...20 Victoria (b) 1857
— 148 —151 ..21 — 1858
— 152 —153...22 — (a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 154 to 155...22 Victoria (b) 1859
— 156 —160...23 — 1860
— 161 —164...24 — 1861
— 165 —168...25 — 1862
— 169 —172...26 — 1863
— 173 —176...27 — 1864
— 177 —180...28 — 1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 181 to 184...29 Victoria...... 1866
— 185 —189...30 — 1867
— 190 —193...31 — ... 1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol. 194 to 198...32 Victoria ... 1868-9
— 199 —203...33 — 1870
— 204 —208...34 — 1871
— 209 —213...35 — 1872
— 214 —217...36 — 1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol. 218 to 221...37 Victoria 1874
— 222 —226...38 — 1875
— 227 —231...39 — 1876
— 232 —236...40 — 1877
— 237 —242...41 — 1878
— 243 —249...42 — ... 1878-9
— 250 & 251...43 — (a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol. 252 to 256...43 Victoria (b) 1880
— 257 —265...44 — 1881
— 266 —273...45 — (a) 1882
— 274 & 275...45 — (b) 1882
— 276 to 283...46 — 1883
— 284 —292...47 — 1884
— 293 —301...48 — ... 1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol. 302 to 307...49 Victoria (a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 308 & 309...49 Victoria (b) 1886
— 310 to 321...50 — 1887
— 322 —332...51 — 1888
— 333 —340...52 — 1889
— 341 —348...53 — 1890
— 349 —356...54 — ... 1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol. 1 to 6...55 Victoria 1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 7 ....56 Victoria 1892
— 8 to 21...57 — ... 1893-4
— 22 — 29...57 — 1894
— 30 — 35...58 — 1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 36 ....59 Victoria 1895
— 37 to 44...59 — ... 1895-6
— 45 — 52...60 — 1897
— 53 — 65...61 — 1898
— 66 — 76...62 — 1899
— 77 ....63 — 1899
— 78 — 83...63 — 1900
— 84 ... 63 & 64 — 1900
— 85 — 87...64 — 1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 88 ....64 Victoria 1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol. 89 .... 1 Edward VII....1901
— 90 to 100 1 — ...1901
— 101 ... 1 & 2 — ...1902
— 102 to 117 2 — ...1902
— 118 to 128 3 — ...1903
— 129 to 140 4 — ...1904
— 141 to 142 5 — ...1905

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education——Most Hon. the Marquess of Londonderry, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
    Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
    Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
    Colonial——Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P.
    War——Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P.
    India——Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty—Rt. Hon. Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Most Noble the Marquess of Linlithgow.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Gerald Balfour, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. Walter Long, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Victor Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Secretary to the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
    Lord Balcarres, M.P.
    Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
    H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
    Admiral Sir John Fisher, G.C.B.
    Rear-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury, K.C.S.I.
    Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
    Capt. F. G. Inglefield, R.N.
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——Arthur H. Lee, Esq., M.P.
Army Council——
    The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
    Lt.-Gen. Sir N. G. Lyttelton, K.C.B., (Chief of General Staff).
    Major-General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General).
    Major-General H. C. O. Plumer, C.B. (Quartermaster-General).
    Major-General Sir J. W. Murray, K.C.B. (Master General of the Ordnance).
    The Under-Secretary of State for War.
    The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
    Secretary. The Permanent Under-Secretary of State for War (Col. Sir E. W. D. Ward, K.C.B.).
Inspector-General of the Forces——General H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, K.G., K.P., etc.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Most Noble the Marquess of Bath.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Donoughmore.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office—W. Bromley Davenport, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. Sir E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
The Lord Advocate——C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——

Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of CLARENDON, G.C.B.
Vice-Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Lord WOLVERTON.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of PEMBROKE AND MONTGOMERY, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of PORTLAND, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sir SAVILE CROSSLEY, Bt., M.V.O., M.P.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount VALENTIA, M.V.O., M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——The Marquess of HAMILTON, M.P.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl WALDEGRAVE.

Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of KINTORE, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of DENBIGH.
- Rt. Hon. Viscount CHURCHILL, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of ERRON.
- Rt. Hon. Lord LAWRENCE.
- Rt. Hon. Lord SUFFIELD, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord KENYON.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——The Most Noble the Marquess of LINLITHGOW.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. A. GRAHAM MURRAY.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. C. SCOTT DICKSON, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of LEVEN AND MELVILLE.
Solicitor-General——E. T. SALVENSEN, Esq., K.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl of DUDLEY.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord ASHBOURNE.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. GEORGE WYNDHAM, M.P.
Under Secretary——Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. HORACE PLUNKETT.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. ATKINSON, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——J. H. M. CAMPBELL, Esq., K.C., M.P.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of ONSLOW.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir HENRY J. L. GRAHAM, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. THESIGER, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——EDWARD HALL ALDERSON, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——ALBERT GRAY, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. HARRISON, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
- Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. SKENE, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. A. LEIGH, Esq.
- Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
- Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. ANSTRUTHER, Esq.
- W. H. HAMILTON GORDON, Esq.

Other Clerks—Hon. A. MCDONNELL; A. H. ROBINSON, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. ST. JOHN, Esq.; V. M. BIDDULPH, Esq.; Hon. E. A. STONOR; H. J. F. BADELEY, Esq.; C. HEADLAM, Esq.; J. B. HOTHAM, Esq.; E. C. VIGORS, Esq.; A. TENNYSON, Esq.; and G. D. LUARD, Esq.
Accountant and Copyist——Mr. T. A. COURT.
Assistant Copyists——Mr. H. P. NORRIS and Mr. R. A. COURT.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. WORFELL, C. E. CHIZLETT, A. M. STOLL, J. W. F. LOCKE, J. MCMILLAN, G. BENNETT, G. T. PHILIP.
Librarian——EDMUND GOSSE, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. BUTLER.
Attendant——Mr. W. WORFELL.

Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. CAMPION, Esq.; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.; Clerk ——B. H. FELL, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. BUTLER.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir FLEETWOOD I. EDWARDS, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. HAND, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. WILLIAMS, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. CHANDLER, E. FOX, F. HOLMAN.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. WALKER, J. HEDLEY, J. LANE, B. GALLOP.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. STREVENS, G. W. CROSS, W. STOPP.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. WOOLACOTT, A. A. EDNEY, J. F. BAUM.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. SOLMAN, J. B. FORSYTH, C. CHAPMAN, W. PHILLIPS, W. W. MEATES.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. CASBON.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. PALMER.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. WILLIAMS.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. PATEY.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir COURTNEY PEREGRINE ILBERT, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——ARTHUR W. NICHOLSON, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. WEBSTER, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. GIBBONS, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. LEY, Esq.
  Committee Office——R. DICKINSON, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. SOMERSET, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. ST. GEORGE TUPPER, Esq.; H. C. TOWER, Esq.; C. V. FRERE, Esq. L. T. LE MARCHANT, Esq.; G. C. GIFFARD, Esq.; Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. SIMEON, Esq.; ARTHUR I. DASENT, Esq.; E. C. HOWE BROWNE, Esq.; HORACE WEST, Esq.; HENRY A. FERGUSON-DAVIE, Esq.; ARTHUR H. ELLIS, Esq.; PERCY A. BULL, Esq.; F. R. WILLIAMS WYNN, Esq.; W. E. GREY, Esq.; F. C. HOLLAND, Esq.; J. W. G. BOND, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. DAWKINS, Esq.; R. P. COLOMB, Esq.; B. H. FELL, Esq.; R. E. CHILDERS, Esq.; J. SCOTT PORTER, Esq.; F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.; W. T. LEGGE, Esq., C. R. TURNER, Esq.; W. K. GIBBONS, Esq.; A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq.; K. J. C. MOORSOM, Esq.; R. D. RADCLIFFE, Esq., W. P. JOHNSTONE, Esq.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——EDWARD GULLY, Esq., C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. CHANDOS LEIGH, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. FRENCH.
Messenger——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq.; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. FELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——H. OTWAY MAYNE, Esq.; JOHN POYSER, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——R. C. WALPOLE, Esq.; Assistant Librarian——TEMPLE FRANKS, Esq., B.C.L. Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART; Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN, W. HAGUE.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers——
  Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURREY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H. HAMBLING.

Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON,

Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. G. WAINWRIGHT, J. GUYATT, R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY.

Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY; Assistant——Mr W. BROADBENT; Porters——Messrs. J. ORAM and J. HART.

Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXLII.

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION, 1905.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 1st MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

Andover Lighting and Power Bill.—Brompton, Chatham, Gillingham, and Rochester Water Bill; Epping Gas Bill; Gas Light and Coke, South Metropolitan, and Commercial Gas Companies Bill; Great Eastern Railway Bill; Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; Great Western Railway (New Railways) Bill, Higham and Hundred of Hoo Water Bill; Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Railway and Dock Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill. Read a second time, and committed 1

Midland Railway Bill.—North Eastern Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. To be read a second time to-morrow 1

Nottingham and Retford Railway Bill.—Southampton and Winchester Great Western Junction Railway (Abandonment) Bill; South Metropolitan Gas Bill; South Suburban Gas Bill; Walker and Wallsend Union Gas Bill; Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill; Weybridge and Walton-upon-Thames Electric Supply Bill; Wrexham Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed 1

PETITIONS.

JUVENILE SMOKING.—Two Petitions from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 2

SUGAR TAX.—Petitions for repeal; from Liscard; Liverpool; Manchester; and Stockport (three); to lie upon the Table 2

Mar. 1.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Agricultural and Technical Instruction Schemes (Ireland).—Return [presented 28th February] to be printed. [No. 70.] 2

Board of Education.—Copy presented, of Statistics of Aid Grant under The Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, 1903–5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 3

Queen Anne's Bounty.—Copy presented, of Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 3

Army and Militia.—Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation for the year ended 30th September, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 3

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Rhodesia Railways, Limited.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 3

Grants-in-Aid for Somaliland.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Earl Percy 3

Swine Fever Regulations.—Question, Mr. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 4

The Metric System.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 5

Metropolitan Ambulance Service.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 5

Heavy Motor Traffic and Wear and Tear of Roads.— Question, Mr. William Keswick (Surrey, Epsom); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 6

Fraudulent Trustees.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 6

Sub-Land Commission—Suggested Sitting at Castletown Berehaven.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork County, W.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 7

Work for the Unemployed.—Question, Mr. Partington (Derbyshire, High Peak); Answer, Lord Balcarres 7

Damage by Frost to Indian Crops.—Question, Mr. David Morgan (Essex, Walthamstow); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 7

Re-instatement of Evicted Tenants in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 8

Gun Licences in Ireland.—Case of Mr. John Murphy of Derrybrick, Turlough.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 8

Mar. 1.] *Page*

Comyn Kenny Estate.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 9

Cost of Somaliland Land Operations.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 9

Treatment of Aborigines in West Australia.—Question, Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 10

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Land Purchase at Milcore.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork County, W.); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 10

The New Rifle.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford).. 11

Home Service Army Recruiting.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 11

Horse and Field Artillery Armaments.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 11

The New Guns.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 12

British Colonies and the Sugar Bounties.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 12

Colonial Representative Institutions.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 13

Chinese in the Transvaal—Secret Societies.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax) and Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 13

Reciprocity Treaty between America and Cuba—Effect on British Trade.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 13

Papers on Macedonia.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Earl Percy 14

French Public Works—Foreign-made Material Excluded.—Question, Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs); Answer, Earl Percy 15

North-Eastern Railway—Fatality at Backworth.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 15

Irish Land Stock.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 16

South African Railways.—Questions, Mr. Whitley (Halifax), Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) and Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 16

Mar. 1.] *Page*

London Telephone System.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 18

Van Accidents in the Metropolis.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 18

North Sea Fisheries Investigation.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 18

Equivalent Grants in the Highland Crofting Counties.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 19

Culloden Estate Leaseholders and the Crofters Act.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 19

Watergrasshill Prosecutions.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 19

Duties of the Irish Board of Agriculture.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.), Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson .. 20

Irish Land Purchase Inspectors.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory) and Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 21

Strabane Teachers' Association's Resolution.—Question, Mr. Hemphill, Tyrone, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 21

Irish Agricultural Department—Catholic Clerks in the Veterinary Branch.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 22

Newry—Warrant Against H. J. Livingstone.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 22

Irish Butter Frauds in British Markets.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 23

Alleged United Irish League.—Outrages at Dingle.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 23

Irish Officials as Handwriting Experts.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 24

Kerry Fair Rent Appeals.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 25

Trinity College Tenantry.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 25

White Estate, Bantry.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 26

Irish Model School Fees.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 26

Department of Agriculture Staff.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 27

CURRYGRANNY POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Lord Stanley 28

EDGEWORTHSTOWN PARCELS DELIVERY.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Lord Stanley 28

DRUMGLASS SCHOOL, DUNGANNON.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 28

LORD MILNER.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 29

NEW BILLS.

Public Health Bill.—" To amend the Public Health Acts," presented by Sir Alfred Hickman; supported by Sir Albert Rollit, Sir Thomas Wrightson, and Sir James Heath; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 15th March, and to be printed. [Bill 71.] 29

Public Libraries Acts (Extension) Bill.—" To extend the Public Libraries Acts to counties," presented by Sir James Rankin; supported by Mr. Bryce, Mr. Kenyon, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Samuel Evans, and Mr. Bull; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 12th April, and to be printed. [Bill 72.] 29

Accidents (Mines and Factories) Bill.—" To amend the Law relating to Returns and Notification of Accidents in Mines, Quarries, Factories, and Workshops," presented by Mr. Cochrane; supported by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas and Mr. Bonar Law; to be read a second time upon Friday, 10th March, and to be printed. [Bill 73.] 29

Government Ships Bill.—" To make provision with respect to Ships which belong to His Majesty, or are held on behalf of or for the benefit of the Crown but do not form part of His Majesty's Navy," presented by Mr. Pretyman; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 74.] 30

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill.—" To extend the Military Lands Acts to Naval and Marine Volunteers," presented by Mr. Pretyman; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 75.] 30

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question [14th February], " That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

" *Most Gracious Sovereign,*

" We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Mount.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 30
Mr. Guest (Plymouth) 42

Mar. 1.] *Page*

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the words—

"But humbly represent to Your Majesty that the increase in National Expenditure under Your Majesty's present advisers has been excessive, and has imposed heavy burdens on the people, for the relief of which it is urgently necessary that at the earliest moment the expenditure of the State should be revised and reduced."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir Edgar Vincent (*Exeter*) 49
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 54
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 59
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) 74
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.*) 78
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 91
Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 94

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 201 ; Noes, 250. (Division List No. 11.)

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

King's Speech (Motion for an Address).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question [14th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*—

"We Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Mount.*)

Question again proposed.

Capt. Donelan (*Cork, E.*) 101
Mr. Cullinan (*Tipperary, S.*) 103

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that this House expresses regret that no promise has been made to deal during the present Session with the pressing need for the improvement of the condition of the labourers in Ireland, notwithstanding the complete unanimity which exists upon the Question amongst all sections of the Irish representation.' "—(*Captain Donelan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Page

Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) .. 106
Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) .. 108
Mr. Chas. Craig (Antrim, S.) .. 110
Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.) .. 113
Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.) .. 116
Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) .. 118
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) .. 120
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) .. 124

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 184 ; Noes, 228. (Division List No. 12.)

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after Midnight, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, Mr. Speaker proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 235 ; Noes, 180. (Division List No. 13.)

Main Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 235 ; Noes, 175. (Division List No. 14.)

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth :—

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household.

SUPPLY.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and that the several Estimates presented to this House during the present Session be referred to the Committee of Supply."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 190 ; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 15.) .. 139

WAYS AND MEANS.—Motion made, and Question put, "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 188 ; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 16.) .. 143

Mar. 2.] Page

NEW BILL.

TRADE MARKS.

Bill to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Trade Marks, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Moulton, Mr. Eve, Mr. Cripps, Mr. Butcher, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Cawley, and Mr. Robson.

Bill presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 76.] 149

And, it being after One of the Clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at six minutes after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—London and India Docks Company [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydfil Scheme Confirmation) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 149

DARIEN GOLD MINING COMPANY.—Petition of the Darien Gold Mining Company, Limited, under their common seal, praying for leave to introduce a Bill "To regulate the capital of the Darien Gold Mining Company, Limited, and for other purposes"; together with a copy of the proposed Bill annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners 149

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a, and committed 149

Central Electric Supply Bill [H.L.]; Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 149

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (STATISTICS OF AID GRANT UNDER VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897, 1903–1905).

Associations constituted under the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, 1903–1905.

Associated schools and amounts of aid grant paid, 1903–1905.

Unassociated schools and amounts of aid grant paid, 1903–1905 .. 149

Mar. 2.] *Page*

TREATY SERIES.

No. 5 (1905).—Convention between the United Kingdom and France respecting Newfoundland and West and Central Africa; signed at London, 8th April, 1904. (Notifications exchanged at London, 8th December, 1904).

No. 6 (1905).—Declaration between the United Kingdom and France respecting Egypt and Morocco; signed at London, 8th April, 1904.

No. 7 (1905).—Declaration between the United Kingdom and France concerning Siam, Madagascar, and the New Hebrides; signed at London, 8th April, 1904 150

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—No. 3326. United States (Baltimore) .. 150

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.—Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year ended 31st December, 1904 150

ARMY AND MILITIA.—Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation for the year ended 30th September, 1904.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 150

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX).—Order made by the county council in the county of Middlesex, dividing the parish of Acton, in the Ealing Parliamentary Division, into two polling districts 150

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Order in Council of the 27th February, 1905, declaring that certificates for sea-going passenger steamers granted in Mauritius shall be of the same force as if granted in the United Kingdom, and that Part III. of the Act shall apply, with modifications, to such certificates 150

SPRING ASSIZES ACT, 1879.—Two Orders in Council of the 27th February, 1905, relating to the ensuing intermediate Spring Assizes 150

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1860-1904.—Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of Visiting Committees to the Prisons at Barliunie, Perth and Peterhead.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 151

Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydfil Scheme Confirmation) Bill [H.L.]; Read 2ª (according to order) 151

Military Manoeuvres Bill [H.L.]; Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 151

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore*).

Lord Monkswell 155
Lord Tweedmouth 158
Lord Hylton 158
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 158

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Mar. 2.] *Page*

Street Betting Bill [H.L.]; House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Lord James of Hereford 159
Lord Davey 161

Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 161

House adjourned at five minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 162

Heckmondwike Improvement Bill.—"To confer upon the Urban District Council of Heckmondwike further powers with regard to the supply of water and electricity, and the improvement, health, local government, and finance of the district; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time 162

Wigan Corporation Bill.—"To consolidate and amend the provisions relating to the tramway undertaking of the Mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Wigan; and to confer further powers upon them in relation to that undertaking; to empower them to erect a town hall and public baths; to make provision for the establishment of a cattle mart; and for other purposes," presented, and read, the first time; and ordered to be read a second time 162

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do nominate a Committee, not exceeding eleven Members, to be called the Police and Sanitary Committee, to whom shall be committed all Private Bills promoted by municipal and other local authorities by which it is proposed to create powers relating to police or Sanitary Regulations in conflict with, deviation from, or excess of the provisions of the general law.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 150 and 173A apply to all such Bills.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That four be the quorum of the Committee.

Ordered, That if the Committee shall report to the Committee of Selection that any clauses of any Bill referred to them (other than clauses containing police and sanitary regulations) are such as, having regard to the terms of reference, it is not in their opinion necessary or advisable for them to deal with, the Committee of Selection shall thereupon refer the Bill to a Select Committee who shall consider those clauses and so much of the Preamble of the Bill as relates thereto, and shall determine the expenditure (if any) to be authorised in respect of the parts of the Bill referred to them. That the Committee shall deal with the remaining clauses of such Bill, and so much of the Preamble as relates thereto, and shall determine the period and mode of repayment of any money authorised by the Select Committee to be borrowed, and shall report the whole Bill to the House, stating in their Report what parts of the Bill have been considered by each Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power if they so determine, to sit as two Committees, and in that event to apportion the Bills referred to the Committee between the two Committees, each of which shall have the full powers of, and be subject to the instructions which apply to the undivided Committee, and that three be the quorum of each of the two Committees.—(*Mr. Cochrane.*) 162

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill.—Petition for additional provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 162

SELECTION (PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899) (COMMISSIONERS).—Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection; That, in pursuance of the provisions of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, they had discharged Mr. Charles Hobhouse, and had selected Mr. Black, to act as Commissioner.
Report to lie upon the Table 162

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 27th February, 1905, declaring that Certificates for Sea-going Passenger Steamers granted in Mauritius shall be of the same force as if granted in the United Kingdom, and that Part III. of the Act shall apply with modifications to such Certificates [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 162

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Middlesex, dividing the Parish of Acton, in the Ealing Parliamentary Division, into two Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 162

BARBADOS.—Copy presented, of Special Rules for Juvenile Adult Prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 162

Mar. 2.] *Page*

Bankruptcy Courts (Ireland).—Annual Returns presented, of the Official Assignees of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland and the Local Courts, Belfast and Cork, for the year 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 162

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3326 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 162

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Suggested Coastguard Station at Sanday, Orkney.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour .. 164

Inquiry into Depression of Fishing Industry in Sutherland and Caithness.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 165

Delivery of London Night Mails in the North of Scotland.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 165

Relatives of Supervising Officers in Post Offices.—Question, Mr. Goddard (Ipswich); Answer, Lord Stanley 166

Interruption of the Telegraph Service with Shetland.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Lord Stanley 166

Belfast Post Office Staff.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 167

Members of Parliament and Civil Servants.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 167

Old Age Pensions—Mr. Collew's Scheme.—Question, Mr. Joseph Howard (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 169

Navy—Age Retirement Rules.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 169

Identification of Law Breaking Motorists.—Question, Mr. Cawley (Lancashire, Prestwich); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 169

Hours of Railway Servants.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 170

Places Available for Successful King's Scholars.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Sir William Anson 170

Indian Budget.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 171

Indian Budget—Causes of Increased Expenditure.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 172

Proceedings of Urban Councils.—Question, Mr. P. J. Kennedy (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 174

Recently Appointed Resident Magistrates—Previous Occupation, etc.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 174

Teachers' Pensions.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 175

Mar. 2.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

FLOGGING IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) .. 175

THE ENCHANTRESS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 175

CAPE GOVERNMENT CUSTOMS DUTIES—REBATE CLAIM.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 176

NEW GUNS FOR THE ARTILLERY.—Questions, Captain Norton (Newington, W.) and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 177

PAYMENT FOR NEW GUNS.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 177

THE NEW RIFLE.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 177

ARMY UNIFORM CHANGES.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 177

BRITISH OFFICERS IN JAPAN.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill and The Master of Elibank (Edinburgh, Midlothian); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 178

STAFF COLLEGE APPOINTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 179

COST OF SOMALILAND OPERATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Gibson Bowles and Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 180

ARMY HAY CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 180

IBADAN.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick, and Leamington) 181

TRANSVAAL LABOUR REGULATIONS.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 181

TRANSVAAL LABOUR STATISTICS.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 182

CANADIAN GARRISONS.—Question, Mr. Rea (Gloucester); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 182

NATAL CHURCH COUNCIL.—Questions, Mr. Channing; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton .. 182

TELEGRAPHISTS' GRIEVANCES.—Question, Capt. Norton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 183

EMIGRATION—POOR LAW GUARDIANS' POWER TO ASSIST.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 184

ABSTRACTOR CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 184

Mar. 2.] Page

Duty Paid Foreign Spirits.—Questions, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 185

The Mall Improvements.—Question, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 186

Heavy Motor Traffic in Scotland.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott-Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 186

Illegal Trawling in Scottish Waters.—Question, Capt. Ellice (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Scott-Dickson 187

Viceregal Poor Law Reform Commission.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 187

Pirie-Iveagh Motor Scheme.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 187

Local Government Orders—Downpatrick Protest.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh and Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 188

O'Brien Estate, County Longford.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 189

Irish Dispensary District—Ardee Inquiry.—Question, Mr. Nolan (Louth, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 189

Kerry County Council Audit.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.), and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 190

Constable M'Garry of Belfast.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 191

Wicklow Protest Against Local Government Board Order.—Questions, Mr. Cogan (Wicklow, E.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 191

Lord Crofton's Estate, County Roscommon.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 192

Cavan Magistracy.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 192

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 193

Longford Grazing Farm Evicted Tenants.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 193

Rasharkin (Antrim) Police Force.—Question, Mr. Kilbride; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 193

River Drainage in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Kilbride; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 194

Re-instatement of Evicted Tenants.—Question, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 195

BRIDGE PARTIES AT CLONMEL COURT HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Cullinan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 195

THE DE FREYNE ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 196

SWINE FEVER IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. Delany, Mr. Flavin and Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) .. 196

PAINTERS' DISPUTE IN DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 198

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 198

PHOENIX PARK FOOTPATHS.—Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 199

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES IN DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. 199

THE IRISH SECRETARYSHIP.—Question, Mr. Swift NacNeill; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) .. 199

ROYAL COMMISSION ON TRADE DISPUTES.—Question, Mr. Bell, Derby); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 200

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE UNEMPLOYED.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 201

THE NEW HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 201

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee), Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), and Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 202

NEW BILLS.

Vaccination Bill.—"To amend the Law in respect to the procedure of officers and justices of the peace administering the several Vaccination Acts," presented by Mr. Philip Stanhope; supported by Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Channing, Mr. Levy, and Sir Charles McLaren; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 77.] .. 205

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment Bill.—"To amend the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894," presented by Mr. Cathcart Wason; supported by Sir William Arrol, Mr. Weir, Sir Andrew Agnew. Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Alexander Cross, Mr. Harmsworth, Colonel Denny, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. James Reid, Mr. John Dewar, and Sir John Batty Tuke; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 78.] 205

Mar. 2.] *Page*

Light Railways Bill.—"To continue and amend The Light Railways Act, 1896," presented by Mr. Gerald Balfour; supported by Mr. Bonar Law; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 79.] 205

Merchant Shipping Bill.—"To amend the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1900," presented by Mr. Gerald Balfour; supported by Mr. Bonar Law; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 80.] 205

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1904–5 (SOMALILAND).—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £550,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Additional Expenditure in respect of the following Army Services, viz:—

	£
Vote 1. Pay, etc., of the Army - - - - -	985,000
,, 2. Medical Establishments, Pay, etc. - - - -	21,000
,, 6. Transport and Remounts - - - - -	265,000
,, 7. Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies - - -	260,000
,, 12. Miscellaneous Effective Services - - -	2,000
,, 14. Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other non-effective charges for Officers, etc. - - - - -	1,000
,, 15. Pensions and other non-effective charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others - - - - - - -	2,000
	1,536,000
Less Surpluses on other Votes - - - - -	386,000
	1,150,000
Deduct Excess Appropriations-in-Aid - - - - -	600,000
	£550,000"

The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 203
Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 210

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head A (Pay, etc., of General Staff) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 210
Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) 212
Colonel Welby (Taunton) 212
Mr. Bromley Davenport 213

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 153; Noes, 202. (Division List No. 17.)

Original Question again proposed.

Sir A. Hayter (Walsall) 217
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 219
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 219
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) .. 221
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 222

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head A (Pay, etc., of General Staff) be reduced by £10,000."—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 223
Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 224
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 226
Mr. Winston Churchill 227
Mr. Arnold-Forster 227
Mr. Courtenay Warner 228
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 229
Mr. McKenna 229
Mr. Winston Churchill 230
Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 230
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 230

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 175 ; Noes, 227. (Division List No. 18.)

Original Question again proposed.

Captain Norton 237

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head C (Regimental Pay, Extra Pay, and Messing Allowances) be reduced by £100,000."—(*Captain Norton.*)

Mr. Gibson Bowles 240
Sir Robert Reid 241
Mr. McKenna 241
Mr. Whitley 242
Mr. Arnold-Forster 243
Mr. Winston Churchill 247
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 250
Mr. Courtenay Warner 251
Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) 252
Mr. Whitley 253
Mr. Arnold-Forster 253

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 190 ; Noes, 221. (Division List No. 19.)

Mar. 2.] Page

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. McKenna 257

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head D (Army Deferred Pay) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 259

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1904–5 (SOMALILAND).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £550,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Additional Expenditure in respect of the following Army Service, viz.:—

	£
Vote 1. Pay, etc., of the Army - - - - - -	985,000
,, 2. Medical Establishments, Pay, etc. - - - -	21,000
,, 6. Transport and Remounts - - - - -	265,000
,, 7. Provisions, Forage and other Supplies - - -	260,000
,, 12. Miscellaneous Effective Services - - - -	2,000
,, 14. Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other non-effective charges for Officers, etc. - - - - -	1,000
,, 15. Pensions and other non-effective charges for Warrant Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, Men, and others - - - - - - -	2,000
	1,536,000
Less Surpluses on other Votes - - - - - - -	386,000
	1,150,000
Deduct Excess Appropriations-in-Aid - - - - -	600,000
	£ 550,000

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head D (Army Deferred Pay) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Captain Jessel (*St. Pancras, S.*) 260
Colonel Welby 261
Colonel Legge (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 262

Page

Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne) 263
Mr. Herbert Robertson (Hackney, S.) 264
Colonel Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton) 265

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 153 ; Noes, 179. (Division List No. 20.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Lloyd George 269

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 271
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 274
Mr. Arnold-Forster 276
Mr. McKenna 276

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 167 ; Noes, 191. (Division List No. 21.)

Original Question again proposed.

Sir A. Hayter 281
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 281

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head E (Regimental Allowances and Expenses) be reduced by £15,150."—(*Mr. Weir.*)

Mr. Joseph Walton 281
Mr. Bromley Davenport 282

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 164 ; Noes, 192. (Division List No. 22.)

Mr. O'Mara 285

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Subhead I (Wages of Civilians attached to Units, etc.) be reduced by £5,000."—(*Mr. O'Mara.*)

Mr. Joseph Walton 287
Mr. Mooney (Dublin Co., S.) 287
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 288
Mr. Dalziel 288
Sir A. Hayter 289
Captain Norton 290
Mr. Bromley Davenport 290
Mr. Weir 291

Mar. 3.] *Page*

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 172; Noes, 198. (Division List No. 23.)

Original Question again proposed.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

THE ADMINISTRATION.—On the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 295
The Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury (*Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington*) 296

COAL EXPORTS, ETC.—Return ordered, "giving, for the year 1904, the export of Coal from each Port in the United Kingdom to each Country Abroad, together with summary statements showing the export of Coal in every period of three months from the principal districts of the United Kingdom to the principal groups of Foreign Countries; and also showing the quantity of Coal shipped at each Port in the United Kingdom, for ships' use on Foreign voyages during like periods (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 96, of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. D. A. Thomas.*) 296

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—North British Railway (General Powers).

Also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—Great Central Railway [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) [H.L.]; Shepton Mallet Gas Company (Electric Lighting) [H.L.].

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 297

Marylebone Chapels Bill [H.L.].—Report from His Majesty's Attorney General received, and ordered to lie on the Table 297

Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Hastings Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]; Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill; Heckmondwike Improvement Bill; Hammersmith, City, and North-East-London Railway Bill; Wigan Corporation Bill. Examiners' Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next 297

Mar. 3.] *Page*

Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.].—Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.]; Bridgewater Canals Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]; Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [H.L.]; County of London Electric Supply Company Bill [H.L.]; Mexborough and Swinton Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 297

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Colonies (Annual).—No. 445. Leeward Islands (Report for 1903–1904). Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 298

Bankruptcy (Ireland).—Returns of the Official Assignees of the King's Bench Division "in Bankruptcy," in Ireland, and of the Local Courts, Belfast and Cork, for the year 1904. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 298

NEW BILLS.

Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment Bill [H.L.] (No. 18).—A Bill to amend the Married Women's Property Act, 1882; And 298

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.] (No. 19).—A Bill for the better prevention of corruption. Were presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1^{a}; and to be printed 298

Committee of Selection for the Standing Committee.—Report from, That the Committee have nominated the following Lords to serve on the Standing Committee :—

L. Archbishop of Canterbury.
E. Halsbury (*L. Chancellor*).
L. Archbishop of York.
E. Vane (*M. Londonderry*). (*L. President*).
M. Salisbury (*L. Privy Seal*).
D. Bedford.
D. Devonshire.
D. Northumberland.
M. Winchester.
M. Lansdowne.
M. Linlithgow.
M. Bath.
E. Clarendon (*L. Chamberlain*).
E. Derby.
E. Denbigh.
E. Stamford.
E. Chesterfield.
E. Jersey.
E. Lauderdale.
E. Carnwath.
E. Stanhope.
E. Waldegrave.
E. Portsmouth.
E. Spencer.

Mar. 3.] *Page*

E. Malmesbury.
E. Westmeath.
E. Belmore.
E. Onslow.
E. Minto.
E. Stradbroke.
E. Cawdor.
E. Camperdown.
E. Lichfield.
E. Yarborough.
E. Dartrey.
E. Lytton.
E. Ancaster.
E. Crewe.
V. Falkland.
V. Sidmouth.
V. Gordon (*E. Aberdeen*).
V. Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*).
V. Hampden.
V. Cross.
V. Knutsford.
V. Llandaff.
V. Goschen.
V. Ridley.
V. Churchill.
L. Bp. London.
L. Bp. Hereford.
L. Bp. Rochester.
L. Zouche of Haryngworth.
L. Windsor.
L. Clifford of Chudleigh.
L. Barnard.
L. Saltoun.
L. Balfour.
L. Monson.
L. Kenyon.
L. Stewart of Garlies (*E. Galloway*).
L. Ribblesdale.
L. Harris.
L. Ranfurly (*E. Ranfurly*).
L. Rosebery (*E. Rosebery*).
L. Kilmarnock (*E. Errol*).
L. Poltimore.
L. Denman.
L. Oranmore and Browne.
L. Kintore (*E. Kintore*).
L. Leigh.
L. Elgin (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*).
L. Belper.
L. Brougham and Vaux.
L. Kinnaird.
L. Lawrence.
L. Wolverton.
L. Sandhurst.
L. Aberdare.
L. Norton.

L. Reay.
L. Tweedmouth.
L. Northbourne.
L. Herries.
L. Monkswell.
L. Ashbourne.
L. Thring.
L. Macnaghten.
L. Ashcombe.
L. Hawkesbury.
L. Stanmore.
L. Davey.
L. Burghclere.
L. James.
L. Heneage.
L. Ludlow.
L. Avebury.
L. Alverstone.
L. Allerton.
Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

National Defence.

Lord Ellenborough 299
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*The Earl of Selborne*) 311
Earl Spencer 314

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Substituted Bills (Standing Order 62 Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill, introduced pursuant to the provisions of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, and referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 62 has been complied with, viz. :—Highland Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 316

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 316

PETITIONS.

Juvenile Smoking.—Petition from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 316

Mar. 3.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SPRING ASSIZES ACT, 1879.—Copies presented, of Two Orders in Council of February 27th, 1905, relating to the ensuing Intermediate Spring Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 317

PUBLIC OFFICES (ACQUISITION OF SITE) ACT, 1895, SESSION 2; PUBLIC OFFICES (WESTMINSTER) SITE ACT, 1896; PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE ACT, 1897; PUBLIC BUILDINGS EXPENSES ACT, 1898; AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS EXPENSES ACT, 1903.—Account presented, showing the moneys issued out of the Consolidated Fund, the moneys borrowed and the securities created in respect thereof, the disposal of moneys issued to the National Debt Commissioners for temporary investment, and the expenditure, under the provisions of the Acts, to March 31st, 1904; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 71.] 317

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 445 (Leeward Islands), Annual Report for 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GERMAN TARIFF.—Copy presented, of Statement showing (1) the new German "General" Customs Tariff; (2) the Modifications made in that Tariff by each of the new German Treaties with Russia, Switzerland, Italy, Roumania, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and Servia; (3) the new German "Conventional" Tariff resulting from all these Modifications; with comparison with all the existing rates of duty on imports from the United Kingdom [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

NATIONAL GALLERY AND TATE GALLERY—ARTIFICIAL LIGHTING.—Question, Colonel Stopford-Sackville (Northamptonshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 318

BUILDING GRANT TO BROUGHTON GIFFON VOLUNTARY SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Sir William Anson 318

RESPONSIBILITY FOR WEIGHING OF POSTAL PACKETS.—Question, Colonel Welby (Taunton); Answer, Lord Stanley 318

PAYMENT OF TITHES IN THE VILAYET OF MONASTIR.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Earl Percy 319

REPORT ON REORGANISATION OF MACEDONIAN GENDARMERIE.—Question, Mr. Moon; Answer, Earl Percy 320

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 320

BALLYHANNIS MATERNITY NURSE.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell (Mayo, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 320

EDUCATION OF CATHOLIC CHILDREN AT LARKHILL, COUNTY SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 321

Page

REINSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 322

PROPORTION OF FIELD GUNS TO SABRES AND BAYONETS IN ARMIES OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND GERMANY.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 323

Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill.

Order for Second Reading read.

[SECOND READING.]

Sir Harry Samuel (*Tower Hamlets, Limehouse*) 323

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) 327
Mr. Austen Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 330
Mr. Brynmor Jones (*Swansea District*) 332
The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 336
Mr. Charles Wilson (*Hull, W.*) 337
Major Evans Gordon (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 338
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 339
Mr. Charles McArthur (*Liverpool, Exchange*) 342
Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 344
Sir Robert Ropner (*Stockton*) 345
Mr. Atherley Jones (*Durham, N.W.*) 346
Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 346
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 346
Mr. Harold Reckitt (*Lincolnshire, Brigg*) 347
Colonel Pilkington (*Lancashire, Newton*) 347

Bill read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill.—[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Mount (*Berkshire, Newbury*) 348

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Mount.*)

Mr. George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) 352
Lord Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 354
Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 356
Mr. Cohen (*Islington, E.*) 358

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Mar. 3.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 360
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 362
Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington) 363
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 364
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 365
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 366
Mr. Spear (Devonshire, Tavistock) 368
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 369
The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 371
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 372

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Bell (Derby) 373
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) 373
Mr. George Whiteley (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) 373

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, &c.

Public Trustee and Executor Bill [Second Reading].—Order for Second Reading read.

Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) 374

Bill read a second time and committed to the Standing Committees on Law, etc.

Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill [Second Reading].—Order for Second Reading read.

Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.) 377

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 378
Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, W.R., Cleveland) 379

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 380
Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Alban's) 381
Mr. John Burns (Battersea) 382

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Motion and Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

Mar. 6.] *Page*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ON THE MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) and Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington) 384

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to the Reserve Forces." [Reserve Forces Bill [Lords.] 384

Adjourned at twenty-nine minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS, MONDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: Barrymore Estate (Petition for Bill), Caledonian Railway

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 385

Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.].—Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a, and committed; the Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 385

Medway and Thames Canal Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. Ordered, that the Bill be not further proceeded with 385

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn; the order made on the 3rd instant discharged, and Bill committed 385

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF ADMIRALTY.—Statement showing present distribution of business between the various members of the Board of Admiralty, dated October 20th, 1904; and that which is superseded, dated January 1st, 1904.

Order in Council, dated August 10th, 1904, showing designations of the various members and secretaries to the Board, and the definition of the business to be assigned to them 385

NAVAL WORKS.—Memorandum showing progress and expenditure, etc., on items included in the Naval Works Act 386

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.—No. 3327. Belgium (Antwerp) 386

CHURCH ESTATES COMMISSION.—Fifty-fourth Report from the Church Estates Commissioners, for the year preceding March 1st, 1905.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 386

Mar. 6.] *Page*

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND).—Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the year ended March 31st, 1904, together with the account for the above period and that from July 26th, 11869 (the date of the Irish Church Act) to March 31st, 1904 386

SEA AND COAST FISHERIES FUND (IRELAND) (NON-CONGESTED DISTRICTS).—Account for the year ended December 31st, 1904.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 386

NEW BILL.

Continuation Schools Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, with respect to school attendance and to secure further attendance under certain conditions at evening continuation schools, classes, or courses of instruction. Was presented by the Lord Bishop of Hereford; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 20.) 386

Newcastle Chapter (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next .. 386

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee 386

Newcastle Chapter (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Bishop of St. Albans 387

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Bishop of St. Albans.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

MR. WYNDHAM'S RESIGNATION.—Question, The Earl of Rosebery; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) .. 387

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

KING'S SPEECH (ANSWER TO ADDRESS).—The COMPTROLLER of the HOUSEHOLD reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address 388

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 62 has been complied with, viz.:—South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 388

Mar. 6.] *Page*

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 63 has been complied with, viz. :—Brentwood Gas Bill; Chelsea Electricity Supply Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 388

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 388

Aylesbury Gas Bill.—Clay Cross Railway (Abandonment) Bill; Croydon Gas Bill; Great Berkhampstead Gas Bill; Hitchin and District Gas Bill; Norwich Union Life Insurance Society Bill; Sunderland and South Shields Water Bill. Read a second time, and committed 389

North British Railway (General Powers) Bill.—"To authorise the North British Railway Company to construct certain new railways; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 389

PETITIONS.

LICENSING ACT, 1902.—Petition from Manchester and Salford, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 389

LICENSING ACTS.—Petition from East Somerset, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 389

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CHURCH ESTATES COMMISSION.—Copy presented, of Fifty-fourth Report from the Church Estates Commissioners for the year preceding 1st March, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 389

SEA AND COAST FISHERIES FUND (IRELAND) (NON-CONGESTED DISTRICTS).—Account presented for the year ended 31st December, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 389

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1905–6 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).—Estimate presented, showing the several Services for which a Vote on Account is required for the year ending 31st March, 1906 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 72.] .. 390

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th February; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 73.] 390

Mar. 6.] Page

BOARD OF ADMIRALTY.—Copy presented, of Order in Council dated 10th August, 1904, showing designations of the various Members of and Secretaries to the Board of Admiralty and the definition of the Business to be assigned to them [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 390

BOARD OF ADMIRALTY.—Copy presented, of Statement showing present distribution of Business between the various Members of the Board of Admiralty, dated 20th October, 1904, and that which it superseded, dated 1st January, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 390

NAVAL WORKS.—Copy presented, of Memorandum showing Progress and Expenditure, etc., on Items included in the Naval Works Act [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 390

NAVY (VESSELS STRUCK OFF EFFECTIVE LIST).—Return (in part) presented, relative thereto (Classification of Ships affected by the re-distribution of the Fleet since October last as will be shown in Appendix B of the Dockyard Expense Accounts, 1903–4) (Part I.) [ordered 22nd February; *Mr. Edmund Robertson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 74.] 390

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3327 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 390

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Church Temporalities (Ireland).—Copy of Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the Account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1904 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 75.] 391

FLEETS (GREAT BRITAIN AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES).—Return ordered, "showing the Fleets of Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Italy, United States of America, and Japan, distinguishing :—Battleships, built and building; Cruisers, built and building; Coast Defence Vessels, built and building; Torpedo Vessels, Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Torpedo Boats, and Submarines, built and building."
"Return to show Date of Launch, Displacement, and Armaments reduced to one common scale (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 136, of Session 1904)."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*) 391

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—OUTSTANDING CLAIMS AGAINST TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 392

DISTURBANCES AMONGST CHINESE COOLIES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 392

PUNISHMENT FOR REFRACTORY CHINESE LABOURERS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal S.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 393

CONGO COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Earl Percy 393

THE CONGO FREE STATE.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Earl Percy 394

Mar. 6.]

Page

The Congo Free State.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Earl Percy 394

Employment of Women after Childbirth.—Question, Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University); Answer, Earl Percy 395

Publication of Irish Franciscan MSS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 395

Retirement of War Office (Abstractor Class) Clerks.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 395

Removal of Wrecks off Irish Coast—Damage to Fishing Gear.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 396

Promotion of Assistant Clerks (Abstractor Class).—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 396

Duties and Remuneration of Customs Watchers.—Question, Mr. Causton (Southwark, W.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 397

Armagh Post Office—Case of Mr. M'Cusker.—Question, Mr. John Campbell (Armagh, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 397

Risk Allowances in the Post Office.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Lord Stanley 397

Parliamentary Grants to Elementary Schools—Physical Condition of Children.—Question, Sir John Gorst; Answer, Sir William Anson .. 398

Cutting of the Hair of Prisoners awaiting Trial.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 398

Marine Works in County Mayo.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 399

Relief Works—County Mayo.—Question, Dr. Ambrose; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 399

Mr. Jones' Estate at Burrishoole, County Mayo.—Question, Dr. Ambrose; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 400

Kerry County Council Audit.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 400

Land Purchase Act, 1903.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 401

Irish Teachers' Pension Fund.—Question, Mr. Ffrench; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 402

Adaptation of Existing Long Rifles for Clip Loading.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 402

Mar. 6.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "CLIO" AND "CADMUS."—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 403

EFFECTIVE AND NON-EFFECTIVE SHIPS RETURN.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, Mr. Pretyman 403

ADMIRALTY ADMINISTRATION.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, Mr. Pretyman 403

H.M.S. "HARRIER" AND "BARHAM."—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) Answer, Mr. Pretyman 404

NAVAL WORKS BILL.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham) .. 404

NAVAL WORKS EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, Mr. Arthur Lee 404

THE NEW RIFLE.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 405

SUBMARINE MINING.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 405

WEST INDIAN GARRISONS.—Question, Mr. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 405

CHINESE LABOURERS AND TRADE UNIONS.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 406

TIBETAN TREATY—CHINESE PLENIPOTENTIARY.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 406

INDIAN POLICE COMMISSION REPORT.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 407

OUTRAGES BY CONGOLESE SOLDIERS—TREATMENT OF WITNESSES.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 408

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT WHISKY AGE GUARANTEES.—Question, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 408

PUBLIC BUILDINGS EXPENSES ACT, 1898, FUND.—Question, Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 409

POST OFFICE AGREEMENT WITH NATIONAL TELEPHONE COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Cohen; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 409

Mar. 6.] *Page*

Foreign Ships and Statutory Law.—Question, Mr. Austen Taylor; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. 410

Sugar Convention—Appeals to the Brussels Permanent Commission.—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 410

New German Commercial Treaties.—Question, Mr. Grenfell (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 411

Swine Fever Regulations in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsay) 411

Importation of Swine from Ireland.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 411

Scottish Local Government Board Medical Inspectors.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 412

Physical Deterioration—Advice to Scottish Local Authorities.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 412

Attadale Scholars and the Achintee River.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 412

Peeblesshire County Council Clerk.—Question, The Master of Elibank (Edinburgh, Midlothian); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 413

Sub-Land Commission Meeting at Bantry.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork County, W.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 413

Kerry Evicted Tenants.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 414

Mr. Collis Sandes' Estate, County Kerry.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 415

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants—Case of Mr. Moore.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 415

Re-Sale of an Estate at Rochfort Bridge, Mullingar.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.) and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 416

Sir J. G. Booth's Estate, County Sligo.—Questions, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.) Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. Kilbride; Answers, Mr. Atkinson 417

Higher Education in Ireland.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 418

St. Patrick's Day Celebration at Cookstown.—Questions, Mr. Doogan (Tyrone, E.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 418

Comyn Kenney Estate, Galway.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 418

Irish Agricultural Department—Staff Grievances.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 420

Mar. 6.] *Page*

LORD DE FREYNE'S ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Hayden; Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 420

LAW OF EVIDENCE IN IRISH COURTS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 421

LAND ACT REGULATIONS FOR REINSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill and Mr. John Redmond; Answers, Mr. Atkinson 420

O'BRIEN ESTATE—COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 422

THE POST OFFICE AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.), Mr. John Redmond and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Lord Stanley 423

ARKLOW POSTMASTERSHIP.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Lord Stanley 425

THE ALIENS BILL.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 425

SIR ANTONY MACDONNELL.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 426

SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 426

TURKISH DEBT DECREE.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 427

LORD SELBORNE'S APPOINTMENT.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 428

LORD SELBORNE'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 428

CONDITIONS OF LORD SELBORNE'S APPOINTMENT.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 428

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN AS COMPANY DIRECTORS.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 429

QUESTION ON PROCEDURE.—Questions, Mr. Lough; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 429

THE UNEMPLOYED.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 430

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Edmund Robertston, Sir Albert Rollit and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 430

RESIGNATION OF THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

Mr. A. J. Balfour 432

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Liefchild Stratten Jones, esquire, for the County of Westmoreland (Northern or Appleby Division) 432

Adjournment.—Lord Selborne's Appointment.—Mr. Swift MacNeill, Member for South Donegal, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the appointment of Lord Selborne to the High Commissionership of South Africa, having regard to the circumstances of his having filled the office of Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies from 1895 till 1900, the period of the Jameson raid, and of friction between the Colonial Office and the South African Republic which led to the Boer War;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen:—

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until the Evening Sitting, of this day 432

Supply (Navy Estimates).—Order for Committee read.

The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) .. 435
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 449
M . McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 450
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) 456

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'This House expresses its satisfaction at the reduction of Naval Estimates effected by the proposed scheme of Distribution of the Fleet, but regrets that His Majesty's Government has not taken steps to procure still further relief by negotiations with Foreign Powers for a general reduction of naval armaments' instead thereof."—(*Mr. McCrae.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth) 459
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) 461
Mr. Majendie (Portsmouth) 463
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 463
Mr. Pretyman 465

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 220; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 24.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 469
Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth) 476
Mr. Kearley 481
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) 483
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 485

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

Mar. 6.] Page

EVENING SITTING.

APPOINTMENT OF LORD SELBORNE AS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

Adjournment (under Standing Order No. 10).

Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 491
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthy Tydvil) 492

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

Mr. Purvis (Peterborough) 493
Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) 494
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 495
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 502
Mr. J. Chamberlain (Birmingham, W.) 505
Mr. Cawley (Lancashire, Prestwitch) 511
Major Seely (Isle of Wight) 511

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 178 ; Noes, 236. (Division List, No. 25.)

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question (March 6th), " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for Committee on Navy Estimates)."—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. Buchanan 517
Mr. Reginald Lucas 517
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 519
Mr. Cumming Macdona (Southwark, Rotherhithe) 521
Mr. Lough 521
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham) 525
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 526
Mr. Swift MacNeill 526

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

THE CHIEF SECRETARYSHIP OF IRELAND.

Questions, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury), Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) and Mr. Dalziel (Kircaldy Burghs) , Answer, Sir A. Acland Hood .. 527

Adjourned at eight minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—

Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—Darien Gold Mining Company—(Petition for Bill).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 529

DARIEN GOLD MINING COMPANY—(PETITION FOR BILL).—Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next 529

Barrymore Estate Bill [H.L.].—Presented, and read 1^{a} 529

Marylebone Chapels Bill [H.L.]; Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill [H.L.].—Read 2^{a} (according to order), and committed 529

West Riding of Yorkshire Rivers Bill [H.L.].—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. The Order of the Day for the Second Reading read, and discharged. Ordered, That the Bill be not further proceeded with 529

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.].—Read 2^{a} (according to order), and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 529

East Cowes Gas Bill [H.L.].—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 27th of February last, discharged, and Bill committed 529

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill.—The order of Friday last referring the Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders to the Standing Orders Committee, discharged 530

Preston Corporation (Ribble Navigation) Bill [H.L.]; Mexborough and Swinton Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.]; Truro Water Bill [H.L.]; Torpoint Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.) :—

E. Lauderdale (chairman),
E. Beauchamp,
V. Hill,
L. Zouche of Haryngworth,
L. Kilmarnock (*E. Erroll*);

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday, the 21st instant, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 530

Mar. 7.] Page

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; Nine Mile Point Railway Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Rhymney Railway Bill [H.L.]; Leeds and Liverpool Canal Bill [H.L.]; Clyde Navigation Bill [H.L.]; Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the follow- Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.) :—

D. Bedford (chairman),
E. Carnwath,
E. Northesk,
L. Monson,
L. Hylton;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills .. 530

Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz. :—

L. Torphicen,
L. Killanin;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Superannuation.—Treasury Minute, dated 3rd March, 1905, declaring that William Eaton, rural postman, Wellingborough Post Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 531

Standing Committee.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That they have added the Lord Monk Bretton to the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 531

Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [H.L.].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Dunboyne 531

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Lord Dunboyne.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Bishopric of Bristol Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

THE INDIAN FOREST SERVICES.

The Earl of Lytton 532

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of the House, the Indian Forest Service should be open to all the Universities of the United Kingdom."—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

Lord Thring 538
The Under Secretary of State for India (*The Marquess of Bath*) 538
Earl Spencer 544
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 546
Viscount Goschen 547
The Lord Bishop of Bristol 549
The Earl of Lytton 549

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 24 ; Not-Contents, 30.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : TUESDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 63 has been complied with, viz. :—Seaham Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 551

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—Darien Gold Mining Company.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 552

Heckmondwike Improvement Bill.—Wigan Corporation Bill ; Bristol Corporation Bill (by Order) ; London County Council (Tramways) Bill (by Order) ; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill (by Order) ; Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill (by Order) ; Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill (by Order) ; Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill (by Order) ; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill (by Order). Read a second time, and committed 553

Mar. 7.] *Page*

Caledonian Railway Bill.—" To confer further powers on the Caledonian Railway Company, in relation to their undertaking ; to authorise them or the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Company to construct a railway to connect the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway with the Clydebank Dock branch of the North British Railway Company, and to acquire a joint interest in such dock branch ; to authorise the Callandar and Oban Railway Company to raise additional capital and to transfer to them the Leitir Mhor Pier and empower them to maintain, regulate, and charge rates at Achnacloich Pier ; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 553

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (CRUISERS NOT STRUCK OFF EFFECTIVE LIST).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd February ; *Mr. Edmund Robertson*] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 73.] 554

NAVY (DOCKYARD EXPENSE ACCOUNTS, 1903–4).—Annual Accounts presented, for 1903–4, of Shipbuilding and Dockyard Transactions, etc., with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No 76.] 554

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 3rd March, 1905, declaring that William Eaton, Rural Postman, Wellingborough Post Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertance on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table 554

COLONIES (REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS).—Address for " Return showing the methods in each case by which Representative Institutions have been conferred upon British Colonies since the Accession of the late Queen Victoria.

Name of Colony.	Date and method of incorporation into British Empire.	Date and method of conferment of Representative Institutions.	Population, revenue, and area at time of conferment of Representative Institutions.

Dr. Macnamara 554

BRITISH MUSEUM.—Copy ordered, " of Account of the Income and Expenditure of the British Museum (Special Trust Funds) for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1905 ; and Return of the number of Persons admitted to visit the Museum and the British Museum (Natural History) in each year from 1899 to 1904, both years inclusive ; together with a Statement of the Progress made in the Arrangement and Description of the Collections, and an Account of Objects added to them in the year 1904."—(*Mr. John Morley.*) 554

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

SIGNAL STATION AT BALLYLYNCH, BALTIMORE.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork, County, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Arthur Lee 554

STAFF AND SALARIES OF IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD AND POOR LAW OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara) ; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 555

Poor Law Officers and Local Government Board in Ireland.—Question, Mr. O'Malley; Answer, Mr. Atkinson. 555

Promotion of Poor Law Officers to Local Government Inspectors or Auditors.—Question, Mr. O'Malley; Answer, Mr. Atkinson. 556

Gambling in Options.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 557

Tonnage Measurement of Ships—Application to Fishing Boats.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 557

Statistical Abstract of British Empire.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 557

Education—Grants for Special Subjects.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 558

Exemption of Children from School Attendance for Ingathering of Crops.—Question, Mr. Morrell (Oxfordshire, Woodstock); Answer, Sir W. Anson 558

Applications for Entry to Residential Training Colleges by Successful King's Scholars.—Question, Mr. Morrell; Answer, Sir William Anson .. 559

Vaccination Fees—Report of Departmental Committees.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 559

Danger to Public from Overhead Wires.—Question, Mr. Martin (Worcestershire, Droitwich); Answer, Lord Stanley 560

Maximum Salary of Telegraphists.—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 561

Utilisation of Peat Bogs in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 561

Sitting of Land Commission at Millstreet, County Cork.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 562

Technical Instruction in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 562

Pupil Fees in Model Schools.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 564

Children sent to Monaghan Female Industrial School.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 564

Reconstruction of Poulduff Pier, County Wexford.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 564

Case of Constable M'Garry.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 565

Irish Provident Assurance Company.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 565

Taxation of Land Values.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 566

Gambling in Options.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 566

Mar. 7.]

Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

CONDITIONS OF NAVAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 567

THE VOLUNTEER GRANT.—Question, Mr. Fuller (Wiltshire, Westbury); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 567

MANUFACTURE OF GUNS BY PRIVATE FIRMS.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 567

THE ARMY ESTIMATES.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 568

THE ARMY COUNCIL AND ARMY REFORM.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 568

MAINTENANCE OF ORDER IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 569

CHINESE COMPETITION WITH WHITE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 569

EDUCATION ON CEYLON ESTATES.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 569

LAND SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 570

UPPER CONGO—NEW BRITISH CONSULS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 570

COMMISSIONERS FOR THE REDUCTION OF THE NATIONAL DEBT.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 571

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 571

REMUNERATION OF EXCISE OFFICERS AND CLERKS IN COLLECTOR'S OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 572

FATALITIES ON ELECTRIC RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) and Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 573

BATH FEMALE TELEGRAPHIST'S GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Barlow (Somersetshire, Frome); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 574

PAY OF LONDON TELEGRAPHISTS.—Question Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Lord Stanley 575

Local Government Accounts.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) .. 575

Physical Deterioration Committee's Report.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 576

Secondary Schools—Fees and Free Scholarships.—Question, Mr. Crooks; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 577

Local Authority Default Act, 1904.—Question, Mr. Macnamara; Answer, Sir William Anson 577

Teaching of the Irish Language in Schools.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, W.); Answer, Sir William Anson 578

Battery Park, Stornoway—Sites for Fishermen's Dwellings.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 578

Shader Landing Place, Lewis.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 579

Milk Supply—Government Inspection of Stock.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 579

Scottish Congested Districts Board—Loans to Fishermen.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 579

Thompson-Orpen Estate, Millstreet, County Cork.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 580

Case of H. J. Livingstone of Newry.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 581

The Handwriting Expert in Sergeant Sullivan's Case.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 582

King Harman Estate, Boyle.—Questions, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.) and Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 583

Belfast Water Supply—Mourne Catchment Area.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 584

Revaluation of Licensed Houses in Belfast.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 585

Irish Estates Commissioners' Report.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 585

Royal Irish Constabulary.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 586

Pay of Royal Irish Constabulary.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 586

Mar. 7.] *Page*

MARYBOROUGH POLICE FORCE.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 586

GRAZING FARM AT TONEYMORE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 587

IRISH LAND PURCHASE ACT.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell and Mr. Hayden; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 587

IRISH SCIENCE.—INSTRUCTION GRANT.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 588

SCHOOL AGE REGULATIONS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 588

IRISH EDUCATION—MR. DALE'S REPORT.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 589

TIPPERARY COURTHOUSE.—Question, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 589

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—MISS ANDERSON'S APPOINTMENT.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 589

IRISH POST OFFICE AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Lord Stanley 590

DUBLIN POSTMEN'S OVERTIME.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Lord Stanley 591

AUXILIARIES IN THE DUBLIN POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Lord Stanley 592

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' PENSION FUND.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 593

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 593

THE GOVERNMENT'S FISCAL POLICY.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 593

TRAINING OF TEACHERS IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Black; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 594

IMPERIAL DEFENCE COMMITTEE AND THE DEFENCE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.—Question, Colonel Welby (Taunton); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 595

OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.—Questions, Mr. Samuel Smith (Flintshire) and Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 595

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 596

Mar. 7.]

Page

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

Sir JAMES FERGUSON reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had appointed Sir James Ferguson to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure; and Mr. John Edward Ellis to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures.

Sir JAMES FERGUSON further reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had agreed to the following resolution: That any Member of the Chairmen's Panel be and he is hereby empowered to ask any other Member of the Chairmen's panel to take his place in case of necessity.

Reports to lie upon the Table 596

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Select Committee.

1. "That, in the case of the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway, Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the Liverpool Corporation Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to insert their additional Provision if the Cmmittee on the Bill think fit."

3. "That, in the case of the Malvern Water, Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for a Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to deposit their Petition for a Bill."

4. "That, in the case of the Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of the 'Donegal County Council,' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

5. "That, in the case of the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway, Petition for Bills, the Standing Orders ought not to be dispensed with."

First Four Resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table 597

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Members to serve on the Standing Committee for the consideration of all Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, which may, by Order of the House, be committed to such Standing Committee:—Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Baird, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Boland, Mr. Griffith Boscawen, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Cawley, Sir Charles Cayzer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir John Colomb, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Vaughan Davies, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Doogan, Sir J. Fortescue

Flannery, Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Garfit, Sir Alfred Hickman, Sir William Holland, Mr. James F. Hope, Sir William Houldsworth, Sir James Joicey, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Grant Lawson, Sir Elliot Lees, Colonel Long, Mr. Charles McArthur, Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. William McKillop, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. O'Mara, Mr. Pike Pease, Colonel Pilkington, Sir James Rankin, Sir Charles Renshaw, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Round, Mr. Runciman, Mr. T. W. Russell, Sir Henry Seton-Karr, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Sir John Barrington Simeon, Sir Edward Strachey, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Theodore Taylor, Mr. Tennant, Mr. Whitley Thomson, Sir William Tomlinson, Mr. Tully, Sir William Walrond, Mr. George Whiteley, Mr. Osmond Williams, Colonel Williams, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Wolff, and Mr. Young.

Mr. Wodehouse further reported from the Committee; That they had nominated the following Members to serve on the Standing Committee for the consideration of all Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure which may, by Order of the House, be committed to such Standing Committee:—The Lord Advocate, Mr. Agg-Gardner, Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Barran, Sir George Bartley, Mr. Boland, Mr. Butcher, Lord Hugh Cecil, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Coghill, Mr. Colston, Mr. Cripps, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Tatton Egerton, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Mr. Samuel Evans, Mr. George Faber, Sir George Fardell, Mr. Flynn, Sir Frederick Gordon, Mr. Goulding, Mr. Henry David Greene, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Harwood, Mr. T. M. Healy, Sir James Heath, Mr. Helder, Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Henry Hobhouse, Mr. John Hutton, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Brynmor-Jones, Mr. Jordan, Sir Lees Knowles, Mr. William Frederick Lawrence, Sir Joseph Leese, Colonel Legge, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Loder, Mr. Loyd, Mr. Macdona, Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Middlemore, Mr. Milvain, Mr. William Moore, Mr. Arthur Morton, Captain Norton, Sir Francis Sharp Powell, Colonel Pryce-Jones, Sir Robert Reid, Mr. Remnant, Mr. Bryn Robers, Mr. Samuel Roberts, Mr. Parker Smith, Mr. Soames, Mr. Soares, Mr. Solicitor-General, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Ure, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Lawrence Waldron, Mr. Robert Wallace, and Sir James Woodhouse

Report to lie upon the Table 598

Selection (Standing Committees).—Mr. Wodehouse reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Fifteen Members to serve on the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure in respect of the Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill:—Mr. Bell, Major Evans-Gordon, Mr. Cameron, Mr. John Burns, Sir Ernest Flower, Mr. Hayes Fisher, Mr. Charles M'Arthur, Colonel Pilkington, Mr. Russell Rea, Mr. Reckitt, Mr. Runciman, Sir Harry Samuel, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Austin Taylor, and Mr. Charles Wilson.

Report to lie upon the Table 599

Selection (Standing Committees).—Mr. Wodehouse reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Fifteen Members to serve on the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill:—Sir Frederick Banbury, Mr. Bell, Mr. Brigg, Mr. Cripps, Mr. Fellowes, Mr. Gardner, Sir Edward Grey, Mr. Hudson, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Mount, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Spear, Viscount Turnour, Mr. Warner, and Mr. George White.

Report to lie upon the Table 599

Selection (Standing Committees).—Mr. Wodehouse reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Fifteen Members to serve on the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, in respect of the Public Trustee and Executor Bill:—Mr. Black, Mr. Fison, Mr. Philip Foster, Mr. Beckitt, Sir J. Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Corrie Grant, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Helme, Mr. Howard, Sir Henry Kimber, Sir Henry Seymour King, Mr. Layland-Barratt, Mr. Platt-Higgins, Mr. Thomas Richards, and Colonel Tufnell.

Report to lie upon the Table 599

NEW BILLS.

Local Authorities (Transfer of Powers) Bill.—“To transfer to the Local Government Board the powers of the Treasury under enactments relating to Local Authorities,” presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; supported by Mr. Grant Lawson; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 21st March, and to be printed. [Bill 81] 600

Tied Houses Bill.—“To abolish Tied Houses,” presented by Mr. Broadhurst; supported by Sir John Brunner, Mr. Thomas Bayley, Mr. Herbert Lewis, and Mr. Levy; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 82) 600

Shop Clubs Bill.—“To amend The Shop Clubs Act, 1902,” presented by Mr. Broadhurst; supported by Sir John Brunner and Mr. Bell; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 83.] 600

Supply (Navy Estimates).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question [6th March], “That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for Committee on Navy Estimates).”—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 600
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 607
Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe) 616
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 618
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) 619
Mr. Osmond Williams (Merioneth) 620

Mr. Pretyman rose in his place, and claimed to move, “That the Question be now put.”

Question put, “That the Question be now put.”

The House divided:—Ayes, 249; Noes, 198. (Division List No. 26.)

Question put accordingly, “That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.”

The House divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 199. (Division List No. 27.)

Mar. 7.] *Page*

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 129,000 officers, seamen, and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, including 20,211 Royal Marines."—Motion by leave withdrawn.

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1904–5 (SOMALILAND).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £550,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Additional Expenditure in respect of the following Army Services, viz. :—

		£
Vote 1.	Pay, etc., of the Army	985,000
,, 2.	Medical Establishments, Pay, etc.	21,000
,, 6.	Transport and Remounts	265,000
,, 7.	Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies	260,000
,, 12.	Miscellaneous Effective Services	2,000
,, 14.	Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other non-effective charges for Officers, etc.	1,000
,, 15.	Pensions and other non-effective charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers and men, and others	2,000
		1,536,000
	Less Surplus on other Votes	386,000
		1,150,000
	Deduct Excess Appropriations-in-Aid	600,000
		£550,000

Sir A. Hayter (*Walsall*) 631
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 632

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head Y (Pay, etc., of Army Reserve) be reduced by £20"—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

Mr. O'Mara (*Kilkenny, S.*) 632
The Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.*) .. 633
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 634
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 638
Major Seely (*Isle of Wight*) 638
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham.*) 639

Page

Mr. O'Mara .. 640
Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 641
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) .. 641

Question put, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head Y (Pay, etc., of Army Reserve) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 204 ; Noes, 261. (Division List No. 28.)

Mr. Chas. Hobhouse (*Bristol, E.*) .. 645
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) .. 651

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head BB (Somaliland Expeditionary Force) be reduced by £10,000."—(*Mr. Charles Hobhouse.*)

Mr. Peel (*Manchester, S.*) .. 653

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again to-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland).

Mr. Kendal O'Brien (*Tipperary, Mid.*) .. 656
Mr. Roche (*Galway, E.*) .. 659

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House learns with the deepest concern that the expectations held out by Ministers during the debates on the Land Act of 1903 in reference to the reinstatement of Evicted Tenants in Ireland have been disappointed ; and is of opinion that the powers given to the Estates Commissioners by the Act of 1903 should be without further delay put into active operation so as to determine whether further legislation is required to achieve an object admitted by the Irish Government to be of vital importance for the peace and contentment of Ireland."—(*Mr. Kendal O'Brien.*)

Mr. Herbert Robertson (*Hackney, S.*) .. 667
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) .. 669
The Attorney-General for Ireland (*Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.*) .. 672
Mr. John Morley (*Montrose Burghs*) .. 681
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) .. 684
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) .. 687
Mr. Duffy (*Galway, S.*) .. 690

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 182 ; Noes, 220. (Division List No. 29.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS.— Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to control the arrangements for the Kitchen and Refreshment Room in the Department of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House.

Ordered, that the Committee do consist of seventeen Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of—Mr. James Bailey, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Dalziel, Sir Horatio Davies, Sir Thomas Firbank, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Jacoby, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Lonsdale, Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore, Mr. Pierpoint, Mr. Power, Mr. William Redmond, and Sir Harry Samuel.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, that Three be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

On the Motion for the Adjournment of the House.

Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, The Secretary of the Treasury (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington).

Adjourned at Ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Highland Railway Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 697

NORWICH UNION LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY [STAMP DUTIES].—Committee to consider of authorising the imposition of a certain Stamp Duty in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Society certain property (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow. (*Mr. Caldwell.*) 697

PETITIONS.

JUVENILE SMOKING.—Petition from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 697

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT 1894 AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Poor Law Medical Officers' Association, in favour; to lie upon the Table 697

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (SUNDAY) BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Chippenham; and Corsham; to lie upon the Table 697

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.—Petition of the Mining Association of Great Britain, against; to lie upon the Table 697

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Ashton-under Lyne; Chorlton-upon-Hardy and Cowdenbeath and Lochgelly; to lie upon the Table 697

Mar. 8.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Loan Fund Board (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Sixty-seventh Annual Report, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 698

Vaccination Expenses. — Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the subject of Vaccination Expenses. Part I. Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 698

Vaccination Expenses.—Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the subject of Vaccination Expenses, together with Appendix and Index to Evidence. Part II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 698

University Colleges (Great Britain) (Grant in Aid).—Copies presented, of (i) Treasury Minute, dated 30th March, 1904; (ii) First Report of the University Colleges Committee, dated 19th December, 1904; (iii) Treasury Minute, dated 28th December, 1904; (iv) Second and Third Reports of the Committee, dated 23rd February, 1905; and (v) Treasury Minute, dated 8th March, 1905, relating to the Grant in Aid of University Colleges, Great Britain [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 698

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade amending the Blackpool and Garstang Light Railway Order, 1901 (Blackpool and Fylde Light Railway (Change of name, etc.) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 698

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the North Lindsey Light Railways Order, 1900 (North Lindsey Light Railways (Amendment) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 698

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Derby, from the Midland Railway Company's (Dore and Chinley) Railway, at or near Hope Station, to Bradwell and Castleton (Hope, Bradwell, and Castleton Light Railway Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.. .. 699

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Mid Suffolk Light Railway Order, 1900 (Mid Suffolk Light Railway (Halesworth Deviation) Order 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 699

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Middlesex, between Hounslow and Cranford, and between Heston, Hounslow, Hanworth, Twickenham, and Sunbury Cross, being extensions of the existing and authorised undertaking of the London United Tramways (1901) Limited (London United Tramways (Light Railway Extensions) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 699

Mar. 8.] *Page*

Railways Abandonment.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Southampton and Winchester Great Western Junction Railway (Abandonment) Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158B]; referred to the Committee on the Bill 699

Papers Laid Upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Soane's Museum, Copy of Statement of the Funds of the Museum of the late Sir John Soane on January 5th, 1905 [by Act] 699

County Courts Act, 1888, and Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, Copy of Order made by the Lord Chancellor, dated February 23rd, 1905, directing that the registrar of the County Court of Warwickshire, held at Birmingham, shall not practise as a solicitor, and that Section 20 of The Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, shall not apply to the office of Registrar of the said County Court [by Act]. 699

Imperial Revenue (Collection and Expenditure) (Great Britain and Ireland).—Return ordered, "relating to Imperial Revenue (Collection and Expenditure) (Great Britain and Ireland) for the year ending the 31st day of March 1905 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 269 of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. Joseph A. Pease.*) 700

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Grants to Shipowners for carrying Boy Sailors.—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 700

Private John Harley, Leinster Regiment.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 701

Nationality of Irish Postmasters.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 701

Postal Arrangements at Glastrigan, County Tipperary.—Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 701

Dismissal of Postal Officials.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 702

Recovery of Forfeited Good Conduct Stripes by Postmen.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Lord Stanley 702

Volunteers in the Post Office—Camp Leave.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Lord Stanley 702

Sick Leave in the Post Office—Case of Mrs. Emberson.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Answer, Lord Stanley 703

Publication of Reports of District Commissioners of the Coal Commission.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 703

Poor Relief—Percentage of Alien Recipients.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 704

Mar. 8.] *Page*

Disposal of Non-effective Ships.—Question, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 704

Irish Local Government Board and Newtown Stewart Cottage Scheme.—Question, Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 704

Extension of Pier at Darby's Point, Achill Islands.—Question, Dr. Ambrose; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 705

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Yacht "Enchantress."—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 705

Grouping of Highland Regiment.—Questions, Master of Elibank (Edinburgh, Midlothian) and Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 706

British Central African Natives in the Transvaal Mines.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 707

Transvaal—Chinese Coolies and Secret Societies.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 707

Transvaal Gold Mines—Labour and Output.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) and Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 708

White Men's Wages in the Transvaal Mines.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 708

Self Government for the Transvaal—Boer Leader's Speeches.—Questions, Mr. Markham and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 709

Coolie Riots in the Transvaal.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer Mr. Lyttelton 710

Effect of Chinese upon White Labour in the Transvaal Mines.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 710

South African War Compensating Claims.—Question, Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 711

Rhodesia—Case of the Late James Murray.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 712

Preferential Customs Duties for British Goods in the Colonies.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield Central); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 712

Employment in the Congo Free State.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 713

Mar. 8.] *Page*

MECCA PILGRIMAGE—THEFT OF CHARITABLE FUNDS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 713

NATIONAL FINANCE—PROVISIONS FOR REALISED DEFICITS.—Questions, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 713

THE BUDGET.—Questions, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 714

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—DEPOSITOR'S ACCOUNTS.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.) and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 715

VACCINATION EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES—CASE OF MR. PHILLIP COOK.—Questions, Mr. Weir and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) .. 716

THE DISASTER TO HOLYHEAD FISHERMEN.—Question, Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 717

FREIGHT CHARGES TO SOUTH AFRICAN PORTS.—Questions, Sir Charles McLaren (Leicestershire, Bosworth); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 717

AMERICAN WHEAT AND FLOUR EXPORTS TO THE UNITED KINGDOM.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 718

COMPARATIVE PRICES OF BREAD IN LONDON AND MANCHESTER.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 718

UNDISCHARGED BANKRUPTS AND COMPANY PROMOTIONS.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness, Burghs) 719

THE HOOLEY-LAWSON PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 719

ST. JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC SCHOOL, NYMPHSFIELD, GLOUCESTERSHIRE.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 721

FOREIGN TRAWLERS IN THE MORAY FIRTH.—Question. Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 721

NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION.—Question. Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 721

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF TERENCE REILLY.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 722

IRISH ELEMENTARY SCIENCE SUB-ORGRANISERS.—Questions, Mr. Sheehy Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 723

TRACTION TRAFFIC ON COUNTY DOWN ROADS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 723

DENNEHY ESTATE, COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 723

DISTRESS IN SLIGO.—Question, Mr. Wm. McKillop (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 724

PUBLIC WORKS IN SLIGO.—Questions, Mr. Wm. McKillop and Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 724

LOUGH MELVIN.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 725

THE DUKE OF ABERCORN AND THE PETTIGO MAGISTRACY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 725

ARNOTT ESTATE, BANDON.—Questions, Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 726

DE FREYNE ESTATE.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 727

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD ORDERS—DOWNPATRICK UNION SUGGESTION—Question, Mr MacVeagh; Answer, Mr Atkinson 727

VIRGINIA ROAD TO DROGHEDA MAIL CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, Lord Stanley 728

AUGHACASHEL, COUNTY LEITRIM—TELEGRAPH ARRANGEMENTS—.Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, Lord Stanley 728

ADDRESSES IN IRISH ON PARCELS.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Lord Stanley 729

LETTERS AND PARCELS ADDRESSED IN THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Lord Stanley 729

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL—THE BECK CASE.—Questions, Mr. Lough and Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 731

UNDERFED SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Questions, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Dr. Macnamara, and Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 731

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 733

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer Mr. A. J. Balfour 734

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Norman Lamont, esquire, for the County of Bute .. 734

NEW BILLS.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Amendment Bill.—"To amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897," presented by Mr. Shackleton; supported by Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Bell, Mr. Crooks, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Burns, Mr. Thomas Richards, and Mr. William Abraham; to be read a second time upon Friday, May 12th, and to be printed. [Bill 84] .. 734

Mar. 8.] *Page*

Marine Insurance Bill.—" To codify the Law relating to Marine Insurance," presented by Mr. Attorney-General ; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 85] 734

Dogs Bill.—" To consolidate and amend the enactments relating to Injury to Live Stock by Dogs, and otherwise to amend the Law relating to Dogs," presented by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes ; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 86] 734

Open Spaces Bill.—" To consolidate the enactments relating to Open Spaces," presented by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 87] 735

Education (Scotland) Bill.

The Lord-Advocate (*Mr. Scott-Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton*) 735

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Education in Scotland, and for other purposes connected therewith."—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Mr. Thomas Shaw (*Hawick Burghs*) 739

Question agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Lord-Advocate and Mr. Cochrane.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—" To amend the Laws relating to Education in Scotland, and for other purposes connected therewith," presented accordingly, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 88.]

— —

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1904–5 (SOMALILAND).—

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £550,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the

31st day of March, 1905, for Additional Expenditure in respect of the following Army Services, viz. :—

		£
Vote 1.	Pay, etc., of the Army	985,000
„ 2.	Medical Establishments, Pay, etc.	21,000
„ 6.	Transport and Remounts	265,000
„ 7.	Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies	260,000
„ 12.	Miscellaneous Effective Services	2,000
„ 14.	Retired Pay, Half Pay, and other non-effective charges for officers, etc.	1,000
„ 15.	Pensions and other non-effective charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others	2,000
		1,536,000
Less Surpluses on other Votes		386,000
		1,150,000
Deduct Excess Appropriations-in-Aid		600,000
		£550,000 ”

Motion made, and Question proposed, “ That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head BB (Somaliland Expeditionary Force) be reduced by £10,000.”—(*Mr. Charles Hobhouse.*)

Mr. Peel (Manchester, S.) 742
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 745
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 755
Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 759
Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) 760
Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket) 761
Mr. John Burns (Battersea) 763
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) 768
Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) 771
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 774
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 778
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 782
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 785
Mr. Marks (Kent, Thanet) 786
Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.) 787
Sir Robert Reid 789
Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) 790

Mr. SECRETARY ARNOLD-FORSTER rose in his place, and claimed to move, “ That the Question be now put.”

Question put, “ That the Question be now put.”

The Committee divided : Ayes, 278 ; Noes, 222. (Division List No. 30.)

Mar. 8.] *Page*

Question put accordingly, " That Item Vote 1, Sub-head BB (Somaliland Expeditionary Force) be reduced by £10,000."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 222 ; Noes, 278. (Division List No. 31.)

Mr. SECRETARY ARNOLD-FORSTER claimed, " That the Original Question be now put."

Original question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 273 ; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 32.)

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow ; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

PREFERENTIAL TRADING WITH THE COLONIES.

Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 805
Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 816

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That, in the opinion of this House, the permanent unity of the British Empire will not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the protective taxation of food."—(*Mr. Winston Churchill.*)

**The Secretary of State for the Colonies* (*Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington*) 820

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Question be not now put." —(*Mr. Lyttelton.*)

Lord George Hamilton (*Middlesex, Ealing*) 82
Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 830
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 839
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 844

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 302 ; Noes, 260. (Division List No. 33.

NEW BILL.

CRIMINAL NEW TRIALS.—Bill to make provision for a new trial in certain criminal cases, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bousfield, Mr. Fletcher Moulton, Mr. Wharton Mr. Lloyd-George, and Sir Albert Rollit.

Criminal New Trials Bill.—" To make provision for a new trial in certain criminal cases," presented accordingly, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, March 22nd, and to be printed. [Bill 89.] 855

Adjourned at twelve minutes after Twelve o'clock

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1905.

SAT FIRST.—The Earl of Northbrook sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 857

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill [H.L.].—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. The order of Friday last referring the Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders to the Standing Orders Committee, discharged. Ordered, That the Bill be not further proceeded with 857

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that all reference to the payment of the costs of the Bill for 1903 be omitted from the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill ought to be dispensed with.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Heckmondwike Improvement Bill ought to be dispensed with, provided that Clauses 10 and 11, and so much of the preamble as relates thereto, be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Wigan Corporation Bill ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramway No. 2 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Aspull Urban District Council be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Petition for the Darien Gold Mining Company Bill ought to be dispensed with, and leave given to introduce the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Hastings Tramways Bill [H.L. ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Clause 7 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Corporation of Bexhill is proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Tramways Nos. 1 and 2 are struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Northamptonshire County Council and that of the Wellingborough Rural District Council are proved before the Committee.

Read, and agreed to 857

Orphan Working School and Alexandra Orphanage Bill [H.L.].—Sheffield University Bill [H.L.]; London Squares and Enclosures (Preservation) Bill [H.L.]. Reports from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table 858

Mar. 9.] *Page*

Metropolitan Railway Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection .. 858

Mexborough and Swinton Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.].—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on Friday and Tuesday last, discharged, and Bill committed 858

Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydfil Scheme Confirmation) Bill [H.L.].—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection. 858

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; Nine Mile Point Railway Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Rhymney Railway Bill [H.L.]; Leeds and Liverpool Canal Bill [H.L.]; Clyde Navigation Bill (H.L.]; Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill [H.L.].—The meeting of the Select Committee (which stands appointed for Tuesday next) put off to Tuesday the 21st instant 858

Preston Corporation (Ribble Navigation) Bill [H.L.].; Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.]; Truro Water Bill [H.L]; Torpoint Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.]; Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Romilly be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Zouche of Haryngworth; read, and agreed to 859

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company Bill [H.L.].; East London and Lower Thames Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.]; City of London Electric Lighting Company Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [H.L.]; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill [H.L.]; Central Electric Supply Bill [H.L.]; County of London Electric Supply Company Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.) :—

E. Camperdown (chairman).
E. Lytton.
L. Zouche of Haryngworth.
L. Aberdare.
L. Estcourt.

Agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday next, at Two o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 859

Gamble's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to dissolve the marriage of Charles George Gamble (formerly of No. 14, Rostrevor Terrace, Orwell Road, Rathgar, but now of Mount Jerome House, both in the county of Dublin, and of 39, Fleet Street, in the city of Dublin), solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, with Ida Gertrude Gamble, his now wife, and to enable him to marry again, and for other purposes. Presented (on petition), and a copy of the proceedings in, and of the decree of divorce of the King's Bench, Matrimonial Division, of the High Court of Justice in Ireland delivered (on oath). Bill read 1ª 859

Gamble's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Petition of Charles George Gamble, of Mount Jerome House, in the county of Dublin, solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, that substituted service of a copy of the Bill and of the Order for the Second Reading thereof, and of all other Orders connected therewith be made upon John Haynes, of 11, Vernon Street, Hammersmith, solicitor, and that in the event of the said Bill not being opposed he may be permitted to read, as he may be advised, the evidence given on the hearing of this petition, and as evidence on the Second Reading of the said Bill; read. Ordered, That the said petition be considered on Monday next .. 860

Malone's Divorce.—Petition of John Richard Malone, of Baronston, in the county of Westmeath, Deputy-Lieutenant, late colonel in the Westmeath Militia, for leave to present a Bill to dissolve his marriage with the Honourable Charlotte Mildred Malone, otherwise D'Autichan, as from the 22nd November 1892, and to confirm his marriage with Catherine Cecil Percy, his present wife, and for other purposes; was presented, and read. Ordered, That the said petition be taken into consideration on Tuesday the 28th instant, and that notice thereof be given to the said Charlotte Mildred Malone. Leave given to the Petitioner and to the said Charlotte Mildred Malone to be heard by Counsel at the Bar upon the said Petition. Copies of the proceedings in the High Court of Justice (Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division) in England delivered (on oath) 860

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Trade Reports: Miscellaneous Series.

No. 629. Cotton Mills of China.

No. 630. Technical Instruction in Germany (Supplementary and Miscellaneous) 861

Germany (New German Tariff as Modified by Treaties).—Statement showing (1) the new German "General" Customs Tariff; (2) the modifications made in that Tariff by each of the new German Treaties with Russia, Switzerland, Italy, Roumania, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and Servia; (3) the new German "Conventional" Tariff resulting from all these modifications; with comparison with the existing German rates of duty on imports from the United Kingdom 861

University Colleges (Great Britain) (Grant in Aid).

Treasury Minute of March 30th, 1904.

First Report of the University Colleges Committee, dated December 19th, 1904.

Treasury Minute of December 28th, 1904.

Second and Third Reports of the Committee, dated February 23rd, 1905.

Treasury Minute of March 8th, 1905, relating to the grant in aid of University Colleges, Great Britain 861

Mar. 9.] *Page*

Vaccination (Expenses).—

Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the subject of vaccination expenses. Part I. Report.

Minutes of evidence, with appendix and index to evidence. Part II.. 861

Loan Fund Board of Ireland.—Sixty-seventh Annual Report, 1904 861

Light Railways Act, 1896.

Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade.—

Amending the Blackpool and Garstang Light Railway Order, 1901.

Amending the Mid-Suffolk Light Railway Order, 1900.

Amending the North Lindsay Light Railways Order, 1900.

Authorising the construction of a light railway in the county of Derby, from the Midland Railway Company's (Dore and Chinley) Railway at or near Hope Station to Bradwell and Castleton.

Authorising the construction of light railways in the county of Middlesex between Hounslow and Cranford, and between Heston, Hounslow, Hanworth Twickenham, and Sunbury Cross, being extensions of the existing and authorised undertaking of the London United Tramways (1901), Limited .. 861

Emigration.—Report on the Emigrants' Information Office, for the year ended December 31st, 1904.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 862

County Courts Act, 1888.—Order of the Lord Chancellor, dated February 23rd, 1905, under Section 45 of the Act, ordering that Arthur Labron Lowe, Registrar of the county court of Warwickshire, held at Birmingham, shall not practice as a solicitor, and that Section 20 of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, shall not apply to the office of the said Arthur Labron Lowe 862

Barbados.—Special Prison Rules for "Juvenile Adult" Prisoners.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 862

Sir John Soane's Museum.—Statement of the Funds, January 5th, 1905.
Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 862

NEW BILLS.

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to regulate whale fisheries in Scotland. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow; read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Tuesday next. (No. 21) 862

Convocations of the Clergy Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to declare the law in regard to the reform of the convocations of Canterbury and York, and to make provision for joint sittings of the said convocations. Was presented by the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 22) .. 863

Mar. 9.] *Page*

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill for granting the use of schoolrooms for public meetings. Was presented by the Lord Burghclere; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 23) 863

A CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.

Earl Spencer 863
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 863
The Marquess of Ripon 864
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 865

Advertisements Regulation Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 865

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

The Earl of Camperdown 871
Lord Belper 873

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Military Manœuvres Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee, according to order.

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair].

Clause 1.

The Marquess of Granby 875

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 14, to leave out Sub-section (3)."—(*The Marquess of Granby.*)

The Marquess of Winchester 876
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 877
Lord Tweedmouth 879
Lord Monkswell 879
Lord Stanmore 880
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 880
Earl Spencer 882
The Earl of Donoughmore 882
The Marquess of Granby 882

On Question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the clause, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 60; Not-Contents, 37.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2.

Lord Tweedmouth 883

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 21, after the word 'repealed' to insert the words 'provided always that the owners of such enclosed woods and plantations, on showing sufficient cause to the local Military Manœuvres Commission, may prohibit entry into any specific wood or plantation being their property.'"—(*Lord Tweedmouth.*)

Earl of Donoughmore 885
The Marquess of Lansdowne 885

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3.

Lord Tweedmouth 886

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, line 25, to leave out the word 'part' and to insert the words 'company or squadron.'"—(*Lord Tweedmouth.*)

The Earl of Donoughmore 886
Lord Tweedmouth 887
Earl of Donoughmore 888

On Question, whether the word proposed to be left out shall stand part of the clause, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 71 ; Not-Contents, 15.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment, and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order) ; Bill reported without Amendment ; Standing Committee negatived ; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 889

Bishopric of Bristol Bill [H.L.] [Third Reading].—Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

The Lord Bishop of Bristol 889

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Bishop of Bristol.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

The Supply of Teachers.

Viscount Galway 889
Lord Stanley of Alderley 891
The Lord Bishop of Bristol 894
Lord Harris 895
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (The Marquess of Londonderry) 89

NEW BILLS.

Prize Courts Bill [H.L.].—A Bill for amending the law relating to the administration of oaths for the purpose of proceedings in prize courts; and .. 900

Naval Prize Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to consolidate with Amendments the enactments relating to naval prize of war. Were presented by the Lord Chancellor read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Monday next 900

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Rotherham, Maltby and Laughton Railway Bill (BY ORDER).—Read a second time, and committed 900

NORWICH UNION LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY [STAMP DUTIES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Society certain property, there be charged a Stamp Duty of five pounds, and such Duty shall be impressed upon the copy of the intended Act to be delivered to the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the section of this Act the marginal note whereof is 'Copy of Act to be registered.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Clause 1:—

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid*) 901
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 901
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 901

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Whitley*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

Mar. 9.] *Page*

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill.—" To abandon the Drogheda section of the undertaking authorised by the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Acts, 1903 and 1904; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 902

Colne Corporation Bill.—Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Colne Corporation Bill to omit Clause 30 of the Bill.—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*) 902

PETITIONS.

Agricultural Rates, Congested Districts, and Burgh Land Tax Relief (Scotland) Act, 1896.—Two Petitions from Renfrewshire, for continuance; to lie upon the Table 902

Licensed Premises (Hours of Closing).—Petition from Bootle, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 902

Town Holdings (Terminable Leases).—Petition from Blackrock, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 902

Women's Enfranchisement Bill.—Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table 902

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Army Estimates, 1905–6.—Copy presented, of Army Estimates of Effective and Non-Effective Services for the year ending 31st March, 1906 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 73.] 903

Army (Ordnance Factories Estimates, 1905–6).—Estimate presented, of the sum required for the year ending 31st March, 1906, to defray the Expenses of the Ordnance Factories [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 78] 903

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series.)—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 629 and 630 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 903

Emigration (Colonies).—Copy presented, of Report on the Emigrants' Information Office for the year ended 31st December 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 903

Sugar (Cost) (Great Britain and Foreign Countries).—Return ordered, " showing the price per pound retail of the kind of sugar most largely consumed by the working classes, whether refined or unrefined, on or about the 1st day of March 1905, in the capital cities of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Holland, Russia, Denmark and Great Britain, respectively, together with the amount, in English currency, of the existing Customs and Excise duties respectively per pound in each case."—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles*) 903

Mar. 9.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

COLONIAL SECURITIES—DOUBLE PAYMENT OF ESTATE DUTY.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 903

PUBLICATION OF REPORT OF COMMISSION OF NATIVE AFFAIRS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 904

ADMINISTRATVE EXPENSES AND INCOME OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONER.—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Sir Lees Knowles .. 904

ORKMEN'S COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 905

MOTOR CAR WHISTLES.—Question Mr. Seely (Lincoln); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 906

REPORT OF MANSION HOUSE UNEMPLOYED COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Whitmore (Chelsea); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 906

ELECTRIFIED DISTRICT RAILWAY—PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC.—Question, Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour .. 907

DIVISION OF THE KINGSTON ESTATE.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 907

ALLEGED THEFT OF £5 NOTE FROM MR. HANNON.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 908

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEN IN CHARGE OF COUNTY AND DISTRICT INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 909

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE ATHLONE UNION.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 909

PROMOTION AND PENSIONS OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 910

POSTAL FACILITIES AT REDFORD-MOY, COUNTY TYRONE.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Lord Stanley 901

APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF TELEGRAPH SUPERINTENDENT AT BRISTOL.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Lord Stanley 910

POSTING OF LATE FEE LETTERS.—Question, Lord Cecil Manners (Leicestershire, Melton); Answer, Lord Stanley 911

SUNDAY DELIVERY OF LETTERS BETWEEN BELTURBET AND MILLTOWN.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley .. 911

EDUCATION—CIRCULAR, 512.—Question, Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.); Answer, Sir William Anson 912

Mar. 9.] *Page*

ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOLS BY CHILDREN RESIDING OUT OF THE DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.); Answer, Sir William Anson .. 912

GAMBLING IN OPTIONS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 913

PREFERENTIAL TRADE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND BRITISH COLONIES.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Earl Percy .. 913

PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT OF INDIAN SUBJECTS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 913

ELECTION OF BOMBAY UNIVERSITY PROVISIONAL SYNDICATE.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 914

INDIAN UNIVERSITIES (VALIDATION) ACT.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 915

TIBET EXPEDITION—REWARDS FOR OFFICERS OF TRANSPORT LINES OF COMMUNICATION.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 915

ARMY LISTS AND MUSTER ROLLS AT THE RECORD OFFICE.—Question, Colonel Welby (Taunton); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 915

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MOORING PLACES FOR DISUSED VESSELS IN THE CLYDE.—Question, Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 916

ARMY RECRUITING.—Question, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 917

SHORT SERVICE.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 917

ARMY ESTABLISHMENT.—Question, Major Seely; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 918

WHITCHURCH RIFLE RANGE.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 918

INDIAN EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 919

EUROPEAN TURKEY.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 919

TURKISH OUTRAGES—REBUILDING OF THE VILLAGES.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen; Answer, Earl Percy 920

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—PURCHASE OF CONSOLS.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 920

INTEREST TO POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITORS.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 921

ELECTRICITY IN MINES.—Question, Mr. Fenwick (Northumberland, Wansbeck); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 921

LABOUR STATISTICS—ANNUAL ABSTRACT.—Question, Mr. Fenwick; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. 922

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—LIMIT OF DEPOSITS.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 922

RURAL POSTMEN'S WAGES.—Questions, Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry) and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answers, Lord Stanley 923

WEST HIGHLAND MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. John Dewar (Inverness); Answer, Lord Stanley 923

BERWICK-ON-TWEED—PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT WALLS.—Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) .. 924

LAND PURCHASE IN IRELAND—ARCHDALE (COUNTY LONGFORD) ESTATE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 924

LONGFORD LAND APPEALS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 924

MONAGHAN LUNATIC ASYLUM—CASE OF NURSE HOLLAND.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 925

MR. ROBERT JEVERS' ESTATE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 925

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—CATHOLIC CLERKS IN THE VETERINARY DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 926

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF JAMES JORDAN OF GRANARD.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Mr. Atkinson 926

DOPPING HEPENSTALL ESTATE, NORTH LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 927

KENMORE GUARDIANS—CHARGES AGAINST THE REV. MR. DUGGAN.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 928

LONGWORTH ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Questions, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.) and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 929

PIRRIE-IVEAGH MOTOR SCHEME.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), and Mr. Cullenan (Tipperary, S.); Answers, Mr. Atkinson 929

SIR GEORGE COLLHURST'S ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 930

Mar. 9.] *Page*

GORE BOOTH ESTATE, SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.), and Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 931

BEET CULTIVATION IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 932

LUGNADIFFA NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 932

ALLEGED OUTRAGE AT WOODVILLE.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 933

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—STAFF GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 934

PALMS SPEAD MORGAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Wm. Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 934

DE FREYNE ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 935

CASE OF H. J. LIVINGSTONE OF NEWRY.—Questions, Mr. Mac Veagh; Answers, Mr. Atkinson 935

RENT REDUCTION IN CLARE.—Question, Mr. Kilbride; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 937

GALWAY HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Chas. Devlin (Galway); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 937

TELEGRAPH LINE TO SCRABBY.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Lord Stanley 938

IRISH LANGUAGE IN THE IRISH POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Lord Stanley 939

IRISH POSTMASTERSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 939

LONGFORD AND ELPHIN MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Lord Stanley 940

WAR OFFICE PURCHASES IN ATHLONE.—Question, Mr. Hayden; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 940

SIR ANTONY MACDONNELL.—Questions, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny), Mr. Labouchere (Northampton), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.), Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe), Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.), Mr. Churchill (Oldham), and Mr. Blake (Longford, S.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 941

THE HIGH COMMISSIONER OF SOUTH AFRICA.—Questions, Mr. Bryce; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 945

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Mr. Chas. Hobhouse, Mr. Churchill, and Major Seely; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 945

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufacutres:—Sir J. Fortescue Flannery; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Llewellyn.

Report to lie upon the Table 946

NEW BILLS.

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Bill.—"To amend The Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886," presented by Mr. Cathcart Wason; supported by Sir Arthur Bignold, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Leveson-Gower, Mr. Harmsworth, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Lamont, Mr. Black, and Mr. Weir; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th March, and to be printed. [Bill 90.] 946

Agricultural Education in Elementary Schools Bill.—"To promote Agricultural Education and Nature Study in Public Elementary Schools," presented by Mr. Jesse Collings; supported by Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Rothschild, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore, Sir Ernest Flower, Mr. Spear, Mr. Morrell, Colonel Webb, and Sir J. Fortescue Flannery; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 91.] 947

Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance Bill.—"To extend The Agricultural Education Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance Act, 1901," presented by Mr. Long; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 92.]

Telegraph (Construction) Bill.—"To amend the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1904, with respect to the Construction and Maintenance of Telegraph Lines," presented by Lord Stanley; supported by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Victor Cavendish; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 93.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1904-5.—CLASS III.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £700, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.) 943

Mar. 9.] *Page*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £600, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Cullinan.*)

Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 952
Mr. J. P. Farrell (*Longford, N.*) 958
Mr. Flynn (*Cork, N.*) 962
Mr. Gordon (*Londonderry, S.*) 965
Mr. Hemphill (*Tyrone, N.*) 966
The Attorney General for Ireland (*Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.*) .. 968
Mr. Murphy (*Kerry, E.*) 982
Sir John Colomb (*Great Yarmouth*) 985
Mr. Delany (*Queen's County, Ossory*) 986

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 218 ; Noes, 246. (Division List No. 34.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 991
Mr. Kilbride (*Kildare, S.*) 996

Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 235 ; Noes, 198. (Division List No. 35.)

Question put accordingly, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £700, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 299 ; Noes, 193. (Division List No. 36.)

And it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

Committee to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvements Bill [by order] [Second Reading].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Mooney (*Dublin County, S.*) 1009
Mr. Nannetti (*Dublin, College Green*) 1010

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Mooney.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Gordon (*Londonderry, N.*) 1012
The Attorney-General for Ireland (*Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N*) .. 1016
Mr. Harrington (*Dublin, Harbour*) 1016
Mr. Wm. Moore (*Antrim, N.*) 1019
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 1020

The House divided :—Ayes, 207 ; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 37.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair].

CIVIL SERVICES SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS III.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £12,000, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending March 31st, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Departments of the Solicitor for the Affairs of His Majesty's Treasury, King's Proctor and Director of Public Prosecutions, the Cost of Prosecutions, and other Legal Proceedings."
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1025

Motion made, and Question proposed, 'That Item BB (Criminal Prosecutions not undertaken by the Director of Public Prosecutions) be reduced by £1,000."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 1026
Mr. Flynn (*Cork, Co., N.*) 1027
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 1027
Mr. John O'Connor (*Kildare, N.*) 1029
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 1030
Mr. Joseph Devlin (*Kilkenny, N.*) 1031
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.*) 1032
Sir Robert Finlay 1033
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 1033
Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) 1034
Mr. Swift MacNeill (*Donegal, S.*) 1034
Mr. McKenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 1035

Mar. 10.] *Page*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Mr. Victor Cavendish 1036
Mr. T. *P. O'Connor* (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 1036
Mr. J. A. Pease (*Essex, Saffron Walden*) 1037

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Small Arms Departments (Enfield and Sparkbrook).

[Motion for a Return.]

Motion proposed.

Adjourned at sixteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 10th MARCH, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Darien Gold Mining Company Bill [H.L.].—Presented (pursuant to leave given yesterday), and read 1ª 1041

Orphan Working School and Alexandra Orphanage Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed 1041

Bristol Blind Asylum Bill [H.L.]; University College, London (Transfer) Bill [H.L.].—Reports from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table 1041

Gamble's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Witnesses to attend on the hearing of the petition for substituted service, one to produce a document 1041

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Scotch Education Department.—Code of Regulations for Day Schools, 1905; with appendices 1041

Board of Education (Circular 523).—Circular as to additional grants on account of pupil teachers.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1041

Metropolitan Cattle Market.—Account of Moneys received and paid by the Chamberlain of the City of London for the year 1904, also on account of extraordinary works executed other than general repairs for the same period. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1041

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Committee have nominated the following Lords to serve as Chairmen of the Standing Committee :—

E. Spencer,
E. Onsow,
E. Camperdown,
V. Cross,
L. Balfour,
L. Elgin (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*),
L. Burghclere.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1041

STANDING COMMITTEE.—Report from the Committee of Chairmen of the Standing Committee, That they have appointed the Viscount Cross Chairman of the Standing Committee ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1042

Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1042

RE-VACCINATION OF CHILDREN.

The Duke of Northumberland 1042
Lord Kenyon 1044

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Prviate Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Metropolitan Police Provisonal Order Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next .. 1045

North-East London Railway Bill (BY ORDER).—Second Reading deferred till Tuesday, 21st March 1045

NORWICH UNION LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY (STAMP DUTIES).

Considered in Commttee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That, in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which,

Mar. 10.] *Page*

in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Society certain property, there be charged a Stamp Duty of five pounds, and such Duty shall be impressed upon the Copy of the intended Act to be delivered to the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the Section of this Act the marginal note whereof is "Copy of Act to be registered."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.*) 1046
Mr. John Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) .. ..

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

PETITIONS.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Arbroath; Brechin; and Forfar; to lie upon the Table 1046

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.—Accounts presented, for the year 1904, with an Account of extraordinary Works executed other than the general Repairs for the same period [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1046

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Circular as to Additional Grants on Account of Pupil Teachers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1046

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (CODE 1905).—Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Day Schools, 1905, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1047

ARMY (MEMORANDUM ON ESTIMATES).—Copy presented, of Memorandum of the Secretary of State relating to the Army Estimates of 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1047

TREATY SERIES (No. 8, 1905).—Copy presented, of Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway respecting Telegraphic Communication between the two countries. Signed at Stockholm, 2nd February, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1047

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

DUBLIN POLICE AND CARMEN.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1047

ROYAL FLEET RESERVE.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1047

WEIGHING OF POSTAL PACKETS.—Question, Colonel Welby (Taunton); Answer, Lord Stanley 1048

ELECTRIFIED DISTRICT RAILWAY—DRIVERS' ASSISTANT.—Question, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1049

DERAILMENT OF TENDER ENGINES DRAWING PASSENGER TRAINS.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1049

Page

MEAT INSPECTION.—Question, Lord George Hamilton (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1050

DAMAGE TO ROADS BY TRACTION ENGINES.—Question, Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1050

PROTECTION FROM FIRE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1051

RETURN OF ACCIDENTS IN MINES.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1051

REVENUE OFFICIALS AND ESTATE DUTY.—Question, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1052

MANUAL INSTRUCTRESSES QUALIFIED AS ASSISTANT MISTRESSES IN SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1052

IRISH TEACHERS IN RECEIPT OF PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1053

LONDON RECRUITING BARRACKS.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1053

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO RIFLE CLUBS.—Question, Mr. Frederick Wilson (Norfolk, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1054

Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Whittaker (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) 1054
Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid.) 1069

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir Thomas Wrightson (St. Pancras, E.) 1075
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) 1080

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Sir Thomas Wrightson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Atherley Jones (Durham, N.W.) 1085
Mr. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth) 1090
Sir William Tomlinson (Preston) 1091
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 1092
The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 1098

Mr. WHITTAKER rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 244; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 38.)

Mar. 10.] *Page*

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided :—Ayes, 248 ; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 39.)

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 252 ; Noes, 130. (Division List No. 40.)

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. Whittaker.*)

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'the Standing Committee on Law, etc.,' and insert the words 'a Select Committee of Fifteen Members.'"—(*Sir Thomas Wrightson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir J. Ferguson (*Manchester, N. E.*) 1120
Mr. Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 1121
Colonel Pilkington (*Lancashire, Newton*) 1121

Question put.

House divided :—Ayes, 247 ; Noes, 142. (Division List No. 41.)

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Five of the clock, and objection being taken to further proceeding. Mr. Speaker proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. WHITTAKER rose in his place, and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

Question proposed, "That the Question be now put."

Question put and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES' OFFICERS—Bill to extend the provisions of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, 1896, to the Officers of urban district councils, and to give such Officers a right of appeal in certain events, ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Leese, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Bathurst, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Bigwood, Mr. Griffith Boscawen, Mr. Robert Cameron, Mr. Cox, Mr. David John Morgan, and Mr. Newdigate. 1127

Local Authorities' Officers Bill.—"To extend the provisions of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, 1896, to the Officers of urban district councils, and to give such Officers a right of appeal in certain events," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 94.] 1127

EDUCATION AUTHORITIES (ACCESS TO BOOKS AND DOCUMENTS.)—Bill to enable ratepayers to inspect Books and Documents of local Education Authorities, ordered to be brought in by Sir Albert Rollit, Dr. Macnamara, Sir George Fardell, Mr. Lough, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Mr. Bousfield, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Moon, and Mr. Forde Ridley... 1127

Education Authorities (Access to Books and Documents) Bill.—"To enable ratepayers to inspect Books and Documents of local Education Authorities," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 95.] 1127

On the Motion that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1128

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled "An Act for re-arranging the boundaries of the dioceses of Bristol, and Gloucester, and Bath and Wells." Bishopric of Bristol Bill [Lords.] 1128

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1905.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND.—Writs and Returns electing the Earl of Darnley a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Viscount Hawarden, deceased, with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto. Delivered (on oath), and Certificate read. 1129

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.].—Petition for additional provision; of the Great Central Railway Company; together with the proposed clauses and amendments annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners .. 1129

Darien Gold Mining Company Bill [H.L.].—Referred to the Examiners .. 1129

Gamble's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Petition of Charles George Gamble, of Mount Jerome House, in the county of Dublin, solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, that substituted service of a copy of the Bill and of the Order for the Second Reading thereof, and of all other Orders connected therewith be made upon John Haynes, of 11, Vernon Street, Hammersmith, solicitor, and that in the event of the said Bill not being opposed, he may be permitted to read, as he may be advised, the evidence given on the hearing of this petition as evidence on the Second Reading of the said Bill; considered (according to order). Counsel called in; a witness examined. Bill to be read 2ª on the first sitting day for Judicial business after the Recess at Easter. The usual Orders made. Ordered, That service of a copy of the Bill, and of the Order for the Second Reading thereof, upon the said John

Mar. 13.] *Page*

Haynes, be deemed as good service of the said Bill and Order as if the same had been personally served upon Ida Gertrude Gamble, the wife of the said Charles George Gamble. Ordered, That, in the event of the said Bill not being opposed, the said John Haynes be permitted to read the said evidence as evidence on the Second Reading of the said Bill 1129

Hastings Tramways Bill[H.L.].—Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1130

Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydfil Scheme Confirmation) Bill [H.L.].—Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [H.L.]; Hessle Gas Bill [H.L.]; Workington Harbour and Dock Bill [H.L.]; Commercial Union Assurance Bill [H.L.]; Clacton Improvement Bill [H.L.]; Clacton-on-Sea Commissioners Bill [H.L.]; Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.):—

E. Hardwicke,
V. Falkland (chairman),
L. Sinclair,
L. Lilford,
L. Carew;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday the 28th instant, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 1130

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Drogheda be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Hylton 1130

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (REDISTRIBUTION OF THE FLEET).—Arrangements consequent on the redistribution of the Fleet 1130

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES.—No. 3328. Austria-Hungary (Trieste) .. 1130

TREATY SERIES, No. 8 (1905).—Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway respecting telegraphic communication between the two countries signed at Stockholm, 2nd February, 1905 .. ..

ARMY (ESTIMATES).—Memorandum of the Secretary of State relating to the Army Estimates of 1905–1906.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1131

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS) STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1905.—No. 141. Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, 1905; dated 28th February 1905 1131

METROPOLIS WATER ACT, 1902.—First Annual Report of the Metropolitan Water Board, for the year ended 31st March, 1904 1131

Mar. 13.] Page

Trustee Savings Banks.—Report of the proceedings of the Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks, for the year ended 20th November 1904; with Appendices. Thirteenth Annual Report.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1131

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877.—Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on 26th November 1904, amending Statute III. ("The Fellows") of the Statutes of the College.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 26) .. 1131

Newcastle Chapter (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Tuesday the 21st instant 1131

Import Duties in India.

The Earl of Portsmouth .. 1131
Lord Coleridge .. 1138
The Under-Secretary of State for India (*The Marquess of Bath*) .. 1140
Lord Reay .. 1146
Viscount Ridley .. 1151
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) .. 1154
The Marquess of Ripon .. 1158
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) .. 1162
The Marquess of Lansdowne .. 1164

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.]—[Second Reading].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) .. 1164

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Avebury .. 1165
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury .. 1166

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment Bill [H.L.]—[Second Reading].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) .. 1165

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª.'—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Prize Courts Bill [H.L.]—[Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) .. 1165

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Mar. 13.] *Page*

Naval Prize Bill [H.L.]—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 1167

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means .. 1167

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 62 has been complied with, viz.:—Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1168

Brentwood Gas Bill; Chelsea Electricity Supply Bill; Seaham Gas Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Ulster and Connaught Light Railways Bill (BY ORDER).—Read a second time, and committed 1168

NORWICH UNION LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY [STAMP DUTIES]. Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Society certain property, there be charged a Stamp Duty of five pounds, and such Duty shall be impressed upon the

Mar. 13.] *Page*

copy of the intended Act to be delivered to the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the section of this Act the marginal note whereof is 'Copy of Act to be registered.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1168
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.*) 1169
Sir Samuel Hoare (*Norwich*) 1169
Mr. Gibson Bowles 1169

And it being quarter past Three of the Clock the debate stood adjourned.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday (Evening Sitting).

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—Read a second time, and committed. 1170

PETITIONS.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1170

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Knutsford, against; to lie upon the Table 1170

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petition from Jarrow, against; to lie upon the Table 1170

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.—Petition from Kirkcaldy, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1170

RETURNS. REPORTS, ETC.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER'S (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.—Account [presented 1st June, 1904] to be printed. [No. 79.] 1170

REDISTRIBUTION OF THE FLEET.—Copy presented, of Statement of Arrangements consequent on the Redistribution of the Fleet [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1170

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).—Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing body of University College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1904, amending Statute III. ("The Fellows") of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 80.] 1170

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD.—Copy presented, of First Annual Report of the Metropolitan Water Board for the year ending 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1170

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (HALF-YEARLY STATEMENTS).—Return presented relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 81.] 1171

Mar. 13.} *Page*

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.—Copy presented, of Thirteenth Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Inspection Committee for the year ended 20th November, 1904, with Appendixes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. No. 82.] 1171

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).—Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, 1905, dated 28th February, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table. 1171

RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Clay Cross Railway (Abandonment) Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order, 158b]; referred to the Committee on the Bill 1171

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

APPOINTMENT OF IRISH MAGISTRATES.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1171

LOAN EXPENDITURE ON NAVAL WORKS.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Arthur Lee 1172

REPAIR OF ROTTEN ROW.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Lord Balcarres 1172

DISTURBANCES IN THE BAHR-EL-GHAZAL.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Earl Percy 1172

BUILDING OF FORTS IN THE CONGO FREE STATE.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Earl Percy. 1173

ALLEGED OUTRAGE BY TURKISH TROOPS AT KUKLISH, SALONICA.—Question, Sir A. Hayter (Walsall); Answer, Earl Percy 1173

LONDON UNEMPLOYED COMMITTEE—SUGGESTED GRANT FROM IMPERIAL EXCHEQUER.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Grant Lawson .. 1174

PRIVACY OF INCOME TAX RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1174

BARRACK ACCOMMODATION IN NORTH CHINA.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1175

DERRYLAUR.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 1175

IRISH EDUCATION—NEW RULES.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) and Mr. P. A. McHugh (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1167

IRISH EDUCATION—ISSUE OF NEW RULES.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1177

DISESTABLISHMENT OF POLICE BARRACKS AT KILDALKEY.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1177

THE LATE W. T. GALWAY'S ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1177

Page

SUBMARINE MINING VOLUNTEER CORPS.—Question Sir Charles Palmer (Durham, Jarrow); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1178

DISCHARGE OF EMPLOYEES IN THE BARRACKS DEPARTMENT.—Question, General Laurie (Pembroke and Haversfordwest); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 1178

EX-SOLDIERS IN GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1179

TRAINFIELD GATE, VICTORIA BARRACKS, BELFAST.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1179

THE ROYAL HORSE ARTILLERY.—Question, General Laurie; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1180

BUILDING OF MARRIED SOLDIERS QUARTERS AT WOOLWICH.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1181

MILITARY MANŒUVRES IN IRELAND ON ST. PATRICK'S DAY.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1181

WAR OFFICE—TREASURY—JAM CONTRACTS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1181

COLONIAL MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.—Question, General Laurie; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1182

SECURITY FOR LAGOS GOVERNMENT INSCRIBED STOCK.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1182

TRANSVAAL CONTRIBUTION AND PROFIT OF PREMIER MINE.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1183

THE PREMIER MINE.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 1183

ALLEGED OUTRAGE BY TURKISH TROOPS AT KUKLISH.—Question, Mr. Hugh Smith (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Earl Percy 1184

PHYSICAL CONDITION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Question, Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University); Answer, Sir William Anson 1184

POST OFFICE AND NATIONAL TELEPHONE COMPANY—TRANSFER OF STAFF.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Lord Stanley 1185

PAY OF POST OFFICE (PROVINCIAL) NIGHT MESSENGERS.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid); Answer, Lord Stanley 1186

APPOINTMENT OF SUB-POSTMASTER AND TELEGRAPH EXTENSION AT LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Lord Stanley 1187

EVICTED TENANTS IN NORTH WEXFORD.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1187

LAND COMMISSION APPEALS IN LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1187

Mar. 13.] *Page*

Illegal Trawling off the Isle of May.—Question, Captain Ellice (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 1188

One-man Companies and Poison Regulations.—Question, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1188

Joint Stock Companies—Case of Attorney-General *v.* Appleton.—Question, Sir John Tuke (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1189

Removal of Wreck off Blackwater, County Wexford.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1189

Outside Employment of Medical Officers of Local Government Board.—Question, Mr. Crooks; Answer, Mr. Grant Lawson 1189

Accidents caused by Gas coming in contact with Leakage of Electric Current.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1190

Employment of Young Persons in Coal Mines.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1190

Precautions against Accidental Poisoning.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1191

Promotion in the Customs Service.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1191

Irish Ancient Monuments—St. Mel's Cathedral.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1192

India—Case of Imperator *v.* A. C. Rolt.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1192

Relief Works in County Galway.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1193

Irish National School Teacher's Salaries.—Question, Mr MacVeagh; Answer, Mr Atkinson 1193

Teacher's Residence attached to St James National School at Athboy (County Meath).—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 1195

The Volunteer Force.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1196

Army Recruiting and Pay.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1197

Schools of Instruction for Volunteer Officers.—Question, Mr. Partington (Derbyshire, High Peak); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1197

Strength of Militia.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster.. 1198

Mar. 13.] Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ANCHORAGES FOR DISUSED IRONCLADS IN THE CLYDE.—Questions, Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) and Dr. Hutchinson (Sussex, Rye); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1199

NON-EFFECTIVE WAR SHIPS.—Questions, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) and Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1199

SUGAR CONVENTION—RUSSO-GERMAN TREATY.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade) Mr. Gerald Balfour Leeds, Central) 1200

SUGAR FREIGHTS ON GERMAN RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1201

HIGHER EDUCATION OF NURSES.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1202

INCREASE OF CONVENTUAL AND MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.), Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), and Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1203

ALIENS IN HIS MAJESTY'S PRISONS.—Questions, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) and Mr. Lough; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas .. 1203

SALE OF POISONS.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 1204

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—REGISTRAR OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AND DEPOSITORS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1205

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—DEPOSITORS' ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Lord Stanley 1205

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL AND THE BRADFORD COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Questions, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) and Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answers, Lord Stanley 1206

DINGWALL POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord Stanley 1207

INVERPOLLY (ROSS-SHIRE) LETTER DELIVERY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Stanley 1207

GIRLS' PUBLIC DAY SCHOOL COMPANY.—Question, Sir George Bartley (Islington, N.); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1208

FEES AND RESTRICTION OF FREE PLACES IN NON-ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Sir William Anson 1209

ISLAND OF LEWIS LINE FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 1209

Mar. 13.] *Page*

ISLAND OF LEWIS FISHERMEN AND THE MANSFIELD COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 1209

RATING OF ECCLESIASTICAL BUILDINGS IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 1210

BELFAST LICENSED VICTUALLERS' VALUATION APPEAL.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) and Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 1210

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAND ACT BY THE ESTATES COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) and Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1212

COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCIL—ELECTIONS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Conor O'Kelly (Mayo, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1212

CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS IN COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Mr. Conor O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1213

SALES TO URBAN TENANTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1213

SLIGO AND THE MARINE WORKS ACT.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1214

CASE OF H. J. LIVINGSTONE OF NEWRY.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1214

SEAGRAVE ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1216

ALLEGED OUTRAGE AT WOODVILLE.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1216

RENT REDUCTIONS IN CLARE.—Question, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1217

CHARITABLE LOANS (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1218

TYPHOID FEVER AT DERRYGONNELLY.—Question, Mr. Edward Mitchell (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1218

HORSE DISEASE AT WATERFORD.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1219

BELTURBET POSTAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Lord Stanley 1219

BELFAST MAIL SERVICE.—Questions, Mr. Sloan and Mr. T. W. Russell; Answers, Lord Stanley 1219

LETTERS ADDRESSED IN THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, W.) and Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.); Answers, Lord Stanley 1220

Mar. 13.]

Page

Clerical Duties in the Dublin Post Office.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Lord Stanley 1221

Irish National Teacher's Pension Fund.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Leitrim, N.) and Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1221

Report of the Estates Commissioners.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1222

Use of Dredger for Galway Harbour.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1222

Galway Docks—Lighting and Dredging.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1223

Private Members' Bills.—Questions, Mr. Weir, Mr. Lamont (Buteshire), and Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1223

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—Questions, Mr. John Morley (Montrose Burghs), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Sloan, and Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1224

The Colonial Conference and the Fiscal Question.—Questions, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire), Mr. Soames (Devonshire, Barnstaple), and Mr. Bruce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1227

High Fees and Restriction of Free Places in Non-Elementary Schools.—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1228

Navy Estimates.—Questions, Mr. Lough and Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1228

Business of the House.—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1229

Store Accounts.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1229

Public Accounts.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1229

Message from the Lords.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law in relation to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children," [Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [Lords] 1230

Adjournment.—Mr. Soares, Member for the Barnstaple Division of Devonshire, rose in his place and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz. "The appointment to the important office of President of the Board of Trade of a person not being a Member of this House;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen—

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until the Evening Sitting, this day 1230

Mar. 13.] *Page*

NEW BILLS.

Agricultural Holdings Bill.—"To amend the Agricultural Holdings Acts, and to make other provisions as to the tenure of agricultural land," presented by Mr. Channing; supported by Mr. Price, Mr. Harold Reckitt, Mr. Brynmor Jones, and Mr. Lambert; to be read a second time upon Friday, May 5th, and to be printed. [Bill 96] 1230

Town Holdings Bill.—"To give compensation to occupying Tenants of Town Holdings for beneficial improvements," presented by Mr. Channing; supported by Sir Walter Foster, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Kearley, and Sir James Woodhouse; to be read a second time upon Friday, May 5th, and to be printed. [Bill 97] 1230

SUPPLY [1ST ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 129,000 officers, seamen, and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on March 31st, 1906, including 20,311 Royal Marines.'

Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 1231

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

The Secretary to the Admiralty (*Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge*) .. 1232
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1234
Lord George Hamilton (*Middlesex, Ealing*) 1235
Sir John Colomb (*Great Yarmouth*) 1236

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 160; Noes, 181. (Division List No. 42.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 1239
Mr. Pretyman 1250
Mr. Kearley (*Devonport*) 1260
Lord George Hamilton 1264
Mr. Benn (*Devonport*) 1270
Sir Fortescue Flannery (*Yorkshire, Shipley*) 1272
Mr. Runciman (*Dewsbury*) 1276
Sir John Colomb 1281

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

ADJOURNMENT (UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. 10) APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE).

Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 1287
Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 1290

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Mr. Purvis (Peterborough) 1292
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1292
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 1299
Mr. Marks (Kent, Thanet) 1304
Mr. Bell (Derby) 1306

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 167 ; Noes, 239. (Division List No. 43.)

SUPPLY [1ST ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 129,000 officers, seamen, and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, including 20,211 Royal Marines."

Mr. Pretyman 1311
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 1313
Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth) 1320

MR. PRETYMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 205 ; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 44.)

Question put accordingly, "That 129,000 officers, seamen, and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, including 20,211 Royal Marines."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 215 ; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 45.)

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported this day; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

ALIENS.—Address for "Return showing the names of all Aliens to whom certificates of naturalisation have been issued, and whose oaths of allegiance have, between the 1st day of January, 1904, and the 31st day of December, 1904, been registered at the Home Office, giving the country and place of residence of the person naturalised, and including information as to any Aliens who have during the same period obtained Acts of Naturalisation from the Legislature (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 124, of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*) 1329

PRIVILEGES.—Ordered, That the Committee of Privileges do consist of Seven Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of :—Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Blake, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. John Edward Ellis, and Mr. Halsey.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 1331

PUBLIC PETITIONS.—Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions Presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills ; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House ; and that the Reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed—And that such Committee have power to direct the printing *in extenso* of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions, as shall appear to require it. And that such Committee have power to report their opinion and observations thereupon to the House.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of—Mr. Allsopp, Mr. Edward Barry, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Mr. Brymer, Sir Charles Dalrymple Colonel Legge, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Sir Henry Meysey-Thompson, Mr. Charles Morley, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Philipps, Mr. Tollemache, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, and Mr. Henry Joseph Wilson.

Ordered That Three be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 1331

Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 98.] 1332

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ON THE MOTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Whitley (Halifax) and Mr. Churchill (Oldham) ; Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Sir A. Acland-Hood (Somersetshire, Wellington) 1332

Adjourned at twenty-nine minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London Squares and Enclosures (Preservation) Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection. 1333

Sheffield University Bill [H.L.]; Bristol Blind Asylum Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª, and committed. 1333

University College, London (Transfer) Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection .. 1333

Metropolitan Railway Bill [H.L.].—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on Thursday last, discharged, and Bill committed 1333

Preston Corporation (Ribble Navigation) Bill [H.L.]; Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.]; Truro Water Bill [H.L.]; Torpoint Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Abinger be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Romilly; read, and agreed to 1333

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company Bill [H.L.]; East London and Lower Thames Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.]; City of London Electric Lighting Company Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [H.L.]; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill [H.L.]; Central Electric Supply Bill [H.L.]; County of London Electric Supply Company Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Romilly be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Estcourt; read, and agreed to 1333

PETITIONS.

SUNDAY CLOSING (SHOPS) BILL [H.L.].—Petitions in favour of; of persons signing; Merthyr Tydfil Urban District Council; and Members of Baptist Church, Dudley, Worcestershire, Read, and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1334

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.—No. 631. Coal Industry of the United States, 1903. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1334

Street Betting Bill [H.L.] (No. 27); Military Manœuvres Bill [H.L.] (No. 28).—Reported from the Standing Committee with an Amendment to each Bill. The Report thereof to be received on Thursday next; and Bills to be printed as amended 1334

Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Avebury 1334

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1340
Lord Belper 1349

Amendment moved—

" To leave out all the words after the word ' That ' for the purpose of inserting the following words ' This House is not prepared to legislate on this subject without further information as to the facts of the case ; and that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the conditions under which Sunday trading is now permitted by law.' "—(*Lord Belper.*)

The Earl of Aberdeen 1349
Earl Spencer 1351
The Lord Bishop of Winchester 1352
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 1354

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee.

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : TUESDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means .. 1355

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Ealing Corporation Bill [BY ORDER].—Read a second time, and committed.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Bill to omit Clause 89 of the Bill.—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*) 1355

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP D).—Ordered, That Mr. William Matthews do attend the Committee on Group D of Private Bills to-morrow, at Eleven of the clock 1355

STANDING ORDERS.—Resolutions reported from the Select Committee :—

1. " That, in the case of the Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

2. "That in the case of the Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Tramways Nos. 1 and 2 are struck out of the Bill unless the consent of the Northamptonshire County Council and that of the Wellingborough Rural District Council are proved before the Committee on the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order had been complied with."

3. "That, in the case of the Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that all reference to the payment of the costs of the Bill for 1903 be omitted from the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with.

4. "That, in the case of the Hastings Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Clause 7 be struck out of the Bill unless the consent of the Corporation of Bexhill is proved before the Committee on the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

5. "That, in the case of the Darien Gold Mining Company Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

6. "That, in the case of the Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 2) Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of the 'Trustees of the Will of the late Alexander Jones,' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought not to be dispensed with."

7. "That, in the case of the Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of the 'Portadown Urban District Council,' against the Bill the said Standing Order ought not to be dispensed with."

8. "That, in the case of the North East London Railway Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of the 'Trustees of the Will of the late Alexander Jones,' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought not to be dispensed with."

First Five Resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table 1356

PETITIONS.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN CLUBS.—Petition from Bradford, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 1357

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.—Petition from Bolton, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 1357

Mar. 14.] Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD.—Report [presented 13th March] to be printed. [No. 83] 1357

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3328 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1358

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 631 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1358

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Public Records (Inland Revenue Department (Estate Duty Office) Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents in the Department of the Inland Revenue (Estate Duty Office) which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [by Act] 1358

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

FREE GRANTS OF SEED IN LOUGHREA RURAL DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1358

LEARNERS IN THE POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) Answer, Lord Stanley 1359

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS IN LISCARROLL AND CHURCHTOWN DISTRICTS (COUNTY CORK).—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., N.); Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1359

VENTILATION OF PUBLIC TELEPHONE CALL-BOXES.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. Georges); Answer, Lord Stanley 1360

POST OFFICE RAILWAY SUB-OFFICES.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Lord Stanley 1361

MID-DAY DELIVERY OF LETTERS AT AGHNACLIFFE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1361

TELEPHONE AGREEMENT—OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION IN THE HOUSE.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1361

PRIVACY OF TELEGRAMS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1361

COMPENSATION FOR AUXILIARY POSTMAN WEBB.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Lord Stanley 1362

SOMALILAND.—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answer, Earl Percy 1362

ACCOMMODATION FOR WOMEN STUDENTS IN TRAINING COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answer, Sir William Anson 1363

COMPANIES AND THE MEDICAL AND DENTAL ACTS.—Question, Sir John Tuke (Edinburgh and St. Andrews University); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas .. 1363

Mar. 14.] *Page*

Gibraltar Harbour Works.—Question, Mr. Bill (Staffordshire, Leek); Answer, Mr. Arthur Lee 1364

Longford Police Force.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1365

Scheme for Purchase of Newtownforbes and Drumlish.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1365

Irish Education—Amalgamation of Boys and Girls Schools.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1366

Cost of Moving Troops from Belfast to Newry.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1366

Field Guns for Fourth West York Volunteer Artillery.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 1366

Pay of Private Soldiers.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1367

Increase of Army Estimates.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1367

Volunteer Force—Allowance and Proposed Changes.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1367

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Whale Island—Officers Accommodation.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham) 1368

Brigade of Guards—Deficiency of Officers.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 1368

London's Defences.—Question, Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1368

Crimean Veterans—Ex-Sergeant Martin's Claim.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1369

Army Wastages.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell N.), Captain Norton (Newington, W.), and Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1369

Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1372

Defence of Halifax and Esquimalt.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth) and Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1373

Coolie Wages in Transvaal Mines.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1373

Mar. 14.] *Page*

COST OF INDIAN GARRISON IN SOMALILAND.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Derbyshire, W.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1374

MARITIME STATES—PROPOSED UNIFICATION OF COLLISION AND SALVAGE LAWS.—Question, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Earl Percy 1374

TURKISH CUSTOMS DUTIES AND MACEDONIAN REFORMS.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Earl Percy 1376

SOMALILAND—THE DEFENCE OF THE TRIBES.—Question, Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.); Answer, Earl Percy 1376

THE PROTECTED TRIBES IN SOMALILAND.—Question, Mr. Lyell; Answer, Earl Percy 1376

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK AND THE COMMISSIONERS FOR THE REDUCTION OF THE NATIONAL DEBT.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1376

COMMERCIAL STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1377

ISLAND OF LEWIS POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1377

LEARNERS IN THE POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1378

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY—ELECTRIFICATION FATALITIES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Bonar Law, Glasgow, Blackfriars) 1378

ST. JOSEPH'S SCHOOL, NYMPHSFIELD.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1379

BUCKINGHAM PALACE IMPROVEMENT WORKS.—Question, Colonel Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1380

PARLIAMENT BUILDING—DISCOMFORT CAUSED TO MEMBERS.—Question, Colonel Welby (Taunton); Answer, Lord Balcarres 1380

VENTILATION OF THE LADIES' GALLERY.—Question, Colonel Welby and Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire); Answer, Lord Balcarres 1380

RAILWAY DIRECTORS ON SELECT COMMITTEES.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny), and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. Wodehouse (Bath), and Mr. Speaker 1381

NESS HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord-Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Blackfriars) 1383

ISLAND OF LEWIS, HEALTH OFFICER.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 1384

Mar. 14.] *Page*

CAHIRCIVEEN RIVER NAVIGATION.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 1384

INSURANCE OF IRISH FISHING BOATS.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1382

ACHILL ISLAND PIER.—Question, Dr. Ambrose; Answer, Mr. Atkinson .. 1385

CATHOLIC DEMONSTRATION IN ARMAGH.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1385

DR. JENNINGS' FARM AT SKIBBEREEN.—Question, Mr. Edward Barry (Cork County, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1386

IRISH AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTORS.—Questions, Mr. Hugh Law and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1386

DUNGLOE (DONEGAL) EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1387

IRISH PRISON MEDICAL OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1387

DE LA SALLA COLLEGE.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1388

RAILWAY DELAYS—LIMERICK BUTTER CASE.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1388

IRISH JURY LAWS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1388

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1389

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—OFFICIAL SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1389

KENMARE FEVER CASE—REV. MR. DUGGAN'S ACTION.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1390

PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY OF IRELAND AND THE LIMERICK TECHNICAL CLASSES. —Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1391

DISTRESS IN THE WEST OF IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Kelly (Mayo, N.); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1391

GALWAY MILL STREAM.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1392

RAILWAY DELAYS—LIMERICK COMPLAINT.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Mr. Bonar Law 1392

DUBLIN TO NORTH OF IRELAND MAIL.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Lord Stanley 1393

Mar. 14.] **Page**

DEFENCE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.—Question, Colonel Welby; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1393

SCOTTISH CHURCH DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1394

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PROPOSAL TO EXPEDITE SUPPLY.—Questions, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee), Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1394

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEE).—Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Fifteen Members to serve on the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure in respect of the Trades Unions and Trades Disputes Bill:—Mr. Attorney-General, Sir Thomas Wrightson, Mr. Duke, Sir William Tomlinson, Colonel Pilkington, Sir Charles Renshaw, Mr. Galloway, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Bell, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Randles, and Mr. Pemberton.

Report to lie upon the Table 1397

NEW BILLS.

Juvenile Smoking Bill.—"To provide for the prevention of Juvenile Smoking," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. John Burns, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Crooks, Sir John Gorst, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Lloyd-George, Major Seely, Dr. Shipman, Sir John Tuke, Mr. Cathcart Wason, and Mr. George White; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 99.] 1398

Sale of Whisky Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the Sale of Whisky, and to provide for the marking of casks and other vessels containing whisky," presented by Sir Herbert Maxwell; supported by Mr. Grenfell, Captain Donelan, Colonel McCalmont, and Mr. Kilbride; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 12th April, and to be printed. [Bill 100.] 1398

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,672,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906."

Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 1398
General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) 1401
Mr. Black (Banffshire) 1403

Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) .. 1404
Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.) .. 1406
Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth) .. 1407
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) .. 1408
Mr. Yerburgh (Chester) .. 1412
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) .. 1416
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) .. 1424

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,072,000 be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Sir Elliott Lees (Birkenhead) .. 1427
Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry) .. 1428

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 128 ; Noes, 262. (Division List, No. 46.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) .. 1433

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,671,500 be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

Sir John Colomb .. 1437
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) .. 1438
Mr. Pretyman .. 1441
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) .. 1441
Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow) .. 1442
Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.) .. 1443
Mr. Majendie (Portsmouth) .. 1445
Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) .. 1447
Mr. Joseph Dublin (Kilkenny, N.) .. 1448

MR. PRETYMAN moved, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 239 ; Noes, 161. (Division List, No. 47.)

Question put accordingly, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,671,500, be granted for the said Service."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 151 ; Noes, 235. (Division List, No. 48.)

MR. PRETYMAN claimed, "That the Original Question be now put."

Original Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,672,000, be granted to his Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending March 31st, 1906," put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 252 ; Noes, 105. (Division List, No. 49.)

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow ; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

Mar. 14.] *Page*

EVENING SITTING.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The City of London (Escape from Fire) Bill [By Order.]—[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 1461
Mr. W. F. D. Smith (*Strand, Westminster*) 1461

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed.

London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill [By Order].—[Second Reading].
Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir Joseph Dimsdale (*London*) 1462

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

Distress in West of Ireland.

Mr. Hayden (*Roscommon, S.*) 1462
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1468

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House is of opinion that the Government has failed in its duty in not anticipating the distress which is so prevalent in the West of Ireland, ample warning of which was given by the condition of the crops during the past two years; that the methods adopted to cope with the distress were proved by previous experience to be ineffective, demoralising, and wasteful, and that the enforcement of Clause 13 of the Local Government Act inflicts a great injustice on the poorest counties in Ireland; and that it considers it one of the first duties of any Government to make suitable provision for meeting such visitations; and that it declares that the present distress is of a preventable character and due entirely to the unnatural conditions prevailing in the West of Ireland by which the agricultural population is banished from the good lands, and compelled to live on holdings incapable of providing a decent maintenance for a family; and that it calls

Mar. 14.] *Page*

upon the Government at once to take all necessary action, whether of an administrative or a legislative character, permanently to remove the causes which have led to the present and previous periods of distress and famine in that part of Ireland."—(*Mr. Hayden.*)

Mr. O'Malley (*Galway, Connemara*) 1478
The Attorney-General for Ireland (*Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.*) .. 1483
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 1490

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 144 ; Noes, 192. (Division List No. 50).

PEACE COMMISSIONERS IN IRELAND.

Mr. P. A. McHugh (*Leitrim, N.*) 1499
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1500
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1501
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 1501
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1501

Return ordered, "setting forth the names and addresses of all persons who have been committed to unlimited terms of imprisonment for Contempt of Court in Ireland to the 31st day of December, 1904 ; the names of the Judges who issued the orders of attachment ; the charges against the persons attached ; and the duration of imprisonment in each case in which the order for attachment was executed (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 145, of session 1902)."—(*Mr. P. A. McHugh.*) .. .. ..

COMMISSION OF THE PEACE (IRELAND).—Returns ordered, "for each county, city, and borough in Ireland of the names of the persons holding the Commission of the Peace, and giving the date of appointment of each such Justice, and, so far as can be ascertained, the designation, profession, or occupation of each such person at the time of his appointment to the Commission of the Peace, stating at the foot of the Return for each county, city, and borough, so far as can be ascertained, and with such accuracy as is possible, in the absence of any official record, the aggregate number of such persons that are Protestants, specifying their denominations, the number that are Roman Catholics, and the number that are members of any other religious denomination, and the number of such persons that are of each such designation, profession, or occupation, so far as the same can be ascertained."

"For the whole of Ireland, of the number of such persons of each religious denomination that are of each such designation, profession, or occupation, so far as the same can be ascertained."

"And of the number of such persons usually resident in such county, city, or borough (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 336, of Session (1902).—(*Mr. Patrick Aloysius McHugh.*)

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES (DUBLIN).

Return ordered, "of the Joint Stock Companies and Limited Liability Companies registered in accordance with the Acts thereunto provided in the municipal district of the City of Dublin, showing their capital as registered, whether ordinary, preference, or debenture."—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

Mar. 14.] *Page*

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES ETC. (DUBLIN, RATEABLE VALUE).

Return ordered, "of the Rateable Valuation as it now stands on the books of the Chief Commissioners for Valuation in Ireland, of the tenements, holdings and hereditaments in respect of which Limited Liability Companies and Joint Stock Companies carrying on business in the municipal district of the city of Dublin are rated for, and upon which rates and taxes are actually levied."—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

THE CLOSURE OF SUPPLY.

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1503
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1503
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 1504
Mr. Churchill (*Oldham*) 1505
Mr. John Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) 1507
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 1508
Major Seely (*Isle of Wight*) 1508
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 1509
Mr. Joseph Walton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley*) 1510
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 1510

Adjourned, at six minutes before One o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOLUME CXLII.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION)

IN THE

SIXTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
FIFTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 1st March, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Andover Lighting and Power Bill; Brompton, Chatham, Gillingham, and Rochester Water Bill; Epping Gas Bill; Gas Light and Coke, South Metropolitan, and Commercial Gas Companies Bill; Great Eastern Railway Bill; Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; Great Western Railway (New Railways) Bill, Higham and Hundred of Hoo Water Bill; Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Railway and Dock Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Midland Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway Bill; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. To be read a second time to-morrow.

Nottingham and Retford Railway Bill; Southampton and Winchester Great Western Junction Railway (Abandonment) Bill; South Metropolitan Gas Bill; South Suburban Gas Bill; Walker and Wallsend Union Gas Bill; Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill; Weybridge and Walton-upon-Thames Electric Supply Bill; Wrexham Gas Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

JUVENILE SMOKING.

Two Petitions from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

SUGAR TAX.

Petitions for repeal; from Liscard; Liverpool; Manchester; and Stockport (three); to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION SCHEMES (IRELAND).

Return [presented 28th February] to be printed. [No. 70.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Statistics of Aid Grant under The Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, 1903-5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

Copy presented, of Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY AND MILITIA.

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation for the year ended 30th September, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Rhodesia Railways, Limited.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the proposed payment of £60,000 to the Rhodesia Railways, Limited, is the award of the arbitrators, and, if so, who were the arbitrators; whether the War Office originally offered £24,000 in satisfaction; and whether we pay an annual subsidy to this company of £20,000 a year, and on what grounds.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) A settlement was arrived at without carrying the matter to arbitration. The War Office at one stage of the negotiations made an offer of £24,817 in respect of certain claims, but other claims amounting to £23,000 were not covered by this offer. As regards the latter part of the Question I must refer the hon. Member to Sessional Paper 277, of 1894. I am prepared to deal fully with the matter in Committee of Supply if necessary.

Grants in Aid for Somaliland.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state the total amount of Grants in Aid for Somaliland already voted; and the particulars of the various Votes and the dates on which they were voted.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The Grants in Aid already voted have been as follows:—1900-1, £60,000, Grant in Aid of Military Expenses; 1902-3, £25,000, in aid of Military Expenses; 1903-4, £50,000, in aid of Military Expenses and to meet the cost of buildings taken over from the Government of India on the transfer of the Protectorate in 1898; 1904-5, £24,600, in aid of Military Expenses. The dates of the various Votes, as given in *Hansard*, appear to be:—1900-1, March 19th, 1901; 1902-3, August 4th, 1902; 1903-4, August 10th, 1903; 1904-5, August 9th, 1904.

Swine Fever Regulations.

MR. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): To ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board have considered the suggestions made to them in December last by the Canterbury Farmers Club and East Kent Chamber of Agriculture, for the better working of the regulations with respect to local outbreaks of swine fever; whether the Board will arrange, by the employment of veterinary surgeons of the neighbourhood, that when a suspected case of swine fever is notified by the police, a veterinary examination shall be made at once, and that, if, upon examination, it is found not to be swine fever, the suspected premises shall be declared free in fourteen days; and whether the Board will grant greater facilities for obtaining licences for the removal of swine for breeding and other purposes, and take measures to ensure prompt payment for slaughtered animals when slaughter has been found necessary.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) The suggestions made by the Canterbury Farmers Club and shortly indicated in the hon. Member's Question have received careful consideration on the part of the Board and were fully dealt with in a letter addressed to the club on January 17th last. On the receipt of a report that swine fever is suspected to exist a veterinary examination is at once made either by one of the Board's veterinary inspectors or by a veterinary surgeon acting on their behalf. If the diagnosis does not point to the presence of disease the premises are freed from restrictions at the end of fourteen days. Arrangements for the issue of licences are made by the local authority and not by the Board. Where the slaughter of swine has been found necessary compensation money is paid at the earliest possible moment.

The Metric System.

Sir THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, having regard to the fact that the foreign trade of Great Britain is conducted mainly with countries where the metric system is in force, will he consider the advisability of taking steps to secure the universal adoption of that system in the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I do not think my hon. friend correctly states the facts. Of the total value of the over-sea trade of this country in 1903, 42 per cent., or less than one-half, was conducted with countries in which the metric system is in force. I do not see my way at present to propose a measure for the compulsory adoption of the metric system in this country, but I may remind my hon. friend that the use of the metric system was legalised for all purposes some years ago, and that it is therefore open to any person trading with foreign countries to make use of it.

Metropolitan Ambulance Service.

Sir THOMAS DEWAR: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the remarks made at the Lambeth Coroner's Court last autumn by Mr. Troutbeck, the coroner, relative to the inefficiency of the metropolitan ambulance service; and can he see his way to introduce such legislation as may be necessary to enable metropolitan boroughs to provide an efficient service.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have not been able to trace the remarks of Mr. Troutbeck to which the hon. Member refers. There is at present no general metropolitan ambulance service. Such a service, if provided at all, ought, in my opinion, to be provided for the whole of London by a single authority and not by the various borough councils. I understand that the London County Council have the matter at present under their consideration. Cases of illness and accidents that occur in the streets are dealt with by the metropolitan police ambulances.

Heavy Motor Traffic and Wear and Tear of Roads.

Mr. WILLIAM KESWICK (Surrey, Epsom): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that during the winter of 1903–4 the ratepayers of Epsom urban district were put to the expense of £2,500 in an endeavour to keep in repair one road used for heavy locomotive traffic; and whether, in view of the evidence before the recent Departmental Committee on Heavy Motor Traffic as to the number of roads in the United Kingdom unable to bear the strain of these loads, and of the increase in the cost of upkeep of main roads in Surrey in 1904 as compared with 1903, ascribed by the county surveyor to the increased locomotive and motor traffic, he will issue an addendum to the Heavy Motor Regulations which come into force on the 1st March giving local highway authorities the same powers over roads as those conferred upon bridge-owners.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am aware that complaints have been made of damage by traction engines to roads in the Epsom urban district. I do not understand that these engines were vehicles which would come under the regulations to which my hon. friend alludes, and I do not think that the evidence before me would justify my giving the highway authorities the same powers with respect to roads as those conferred with respect to bridges on persons liable to repair them.

Fraudulent Trustees.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask Mr. Attorney-General if his attention has been called to the losses inflicted upon the community by fraudulent breaches of trust; and if he can inform the House of the number of persons convicted of this crime in the last four years; and if he proposes to take any preventive action in the matter.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) I am informed that during the years 1901, 1902, 1903, and 1904 there were convictions in twenty-two cases of prosecution of fraudulent trustees by the Director of Public Prosecutions. I cannot promise any further legislation on the subject at present.

Sub-Land Commission—Suggested Sitting at Castletown Berehaven.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to a proposed sitting of the Sub-Land Commission at Bantry on March 7th; whether he is aware that on the list for hearing there are forty-seven cases from Castletown Berehaven, and only seven from Bantry; and whether, in view of the fact that Castletown is thirty-five miles from Bantry, and also that the majority of the people whose cases are to be heard are poor, he will direct the Sub-Commissioners to hold a sitting at Castletown Berehaven.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) It has been found necessary to communicate with the Chairman of the Sub-Commission in respect to this Question, and I will ask the hon. Member to postpone it until Monday next.

Work for the Unemployed.

Mr. PARTINGTON (Derbyshire, High Peak): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether, with a view to providing useful work for the unemployed, he will consider the advisability of continuing the roads in Hyde Park round Kensington Gardens.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The expediency of such an alteration in Kensington Gardens is a question upon which there has been great diversity of opinion. The First Commissioner would not be prepared to order this work without the approval of Parliament; but he must not be understood as indicating any views at present as to whether it should be carried out or not.

Damage by Frost to Indian Crops.

Mr. DAVID MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that damage has been done to the growing crops in the Punjaub by frost, and of the danger of famine in that district in May and June, he will say what precautions are being taken to meet distress.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am aware that unusual cold weather has prevailed this year in Northern India, and that serious damage from frost has been sustained by the crops, especially in the united provinces of Agra and Oudh. In the Punjaub the injury is probably less, as the crops there are later. The Viceroy, with whom I have been in communication, informs me that there is no cause for anxiety. Should any distress unhappily arise in any local area, the local governments are fully prepared to deal with it in accordance with the provisions of the Famine Codes.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants in Ireland.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state with regard to the evicted tenants reinstated by the Estates Commissioners under the Act of 1903: total number of evicted tenants reinstated up to the December 31st, 1904; name of each tenant; name of estate from which he had been evicted; area, former rent, and valuation of farm; county and townland where farm is situated; whether tenant was reinstated in farm from which he had been evicted or provided with new farm; full particulars in either case of the terms under which the tenant was reinstated, showing amount of annuity; and whether reinstatement was carried out in connection with or independently of sale of estate from which tenant had been evicted.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) I regret to have to ask the hon. Gentleman to postpone this Question until Friday next.

Gun Licences in Ireland — Case of Mr. John Murphy, of Derrybrick Turlough.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. John Murphy, of Derrybrick Turlough, Castlebar, county Mayo, has been refused a gun licence, which he is in need of to protect his crops from vermin; if he can state any reason for the refusal, in view of Mr. Murphy's character and the fact that no charge has been made by the police; and whether he will communicate with the resident magistrate of the district on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The application of Mr. Murphy for a licence to keep a gun was refused by the licensing officer in the exercise of the discretion vested in him by law. The Government is unable to state the reasons for the refusal, and cannot interfere in the matter as suggested.

Comyn Kenny Estate.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state when the tenants in the neighbourhood of the Comyn Kenny Estate, in the county of Galway, will get possession of the land; and, should there be any further delay, will he see that the land is temporarily let to them until the matter is finally arranged.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) This estate has not yet been vested in the Congested Districts Board, and to prevent loss the Board has made temporary arrangements for the grazing of the lands. Whether any applications were received from neighbouring tenants for grazing will be ascertained.

Cost of Somaliland Operations.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: To ask the Secretary of State for War what has been the total cost of the military operations in Somaliland, including the items of expenditure detailed in the additional Army Estimate, 1904–5; and what have been the various amounts of the Votes already granted by the House for the Somaliland Expedition out of Army Votes and the dates on which they were voted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The total cost has been £2,494,000. The Votes already granted are:—Supplementary Estimate, March 3rd, 1903, £50,100; Included in Army Estimates, 1903–4, £250,000: Supplementary Estimate, February 25th, 1904, £1,600,000. Total £1,900,100.

Treatment of Aborigines in West Australia.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government purpose making any representations to the Government of West Australia with reference to the treatment of aborigines in that country, as disclosed by the report of Dr. Roth, the Commissioner appointed to investigate this question.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have not yet seen the report by Dr. Roth to which the hon. Member refers, but I have asked the Governor of Western Australia for a copy. I understand that it is probable that legislation will shortly be introduced in the colony dealing with the matters to which Dr. Roth calls attention.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Land Purchase at Milcore.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that since the passing of the Land Purchase Act of 1903 the Admiralty have taken a farm on the Clinton Estate at Milcore, from which Cornelius Murphy has been evicted; and, if so, will he say what amount was paid to the agent on the estate for Mr. Cornelius Murphy's farm; whether, seeing that Michael Murphy, a tenant adjoining the farm held by Cornelius Murphy, received £700 for his goodwill of a farm purchased by the Admiralty, the case of Cornelius Murphy will be considered and compensation awarded him.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The Admiralty have taken the farm in question with other land for naval purposes. Under the award of the arbitrator the Admiralty paid to the person legally entitled the full amount of compensation as owner and occupier. So far as they are aware, no separate award was made for this particular farm. The Admiralty cannot under any circumstances be concerned with Murphy, as when they took possession he had been evicted some years previously for non-payment of rent, and the land was in the occupation of the owner.

MR GILHOOLY: Is this the way the Government are going to restore evicted tenants to their farms — by grabbing their holdings?

[No Answer was returned.]

The New Rifle.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state upon what date the manufacture of the new rifle was commenced and how many new rifles have been issued; also how many are now ready for issue.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The manufacture of the components of the new rifle commenced in March, 1903. 127,300 new rifles have been issued and 27,000 are ready for issue.

Home-Service Army Recruiting.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether recruiting has been opened for the Home-Service Army; and, if not, when it is proposed to do so.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: As I explained to the House in debate on the Address, short-service enlistment will not be introduced until the full measure of the long-service element in the Army necessary to furnish the Indian drafts has been restored.

Horse and Field Artillery Armament.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether in January, 1900, the Director-General of Ordnance drew the attention of the Government to the necessity of providing a new gun, and proposed to appoint a Committee of Inquiry into the matter; and whether a full year elapsed before the Committee was appointed.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: In January, 1900, the Director-General of Ordnance proposed that a special Committee of officers who had experience in the South African War, with General Marshall as president, should be appointed to consider the re-armament of the Horse and Field Artillery as soon as they could be recalled from South Africa. General Marshall arrived in England in December, 1900, and the Committee was appointed in January, 1901.

The New Guns.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether the designs for the new guns were ready in July, 1901, and the trial guns not ordered until February, 1902; and when were the experimental batteries ordered.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The conditions for preparation of designs of new guns for trial were formulated in July, 1901, and designs were called for the same month. The designs were received in October, 1901, and numerous modifications had to be discussed and arranged. The orders for eight trial guns were given in February, 1902. The trial guns were delivered in August and September, 1902, and subjected to various trials. None were satisfactory, and modified designs were prepared to which the experimental batteries were ordered in December, 1902.

British Colonies and the Sugar Bounties.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade do His Majesty's Government propose to take any steps in order to carry out the abolition of sugar bounties, the equalisation of the conditions of competition between the beet and cane sugar, and the promotion of the consumption of sugar declared by the Sugar Convention to be the object of that Convention, by representing to those British self-governing Colonies which have been declared to give a bounty, viz., Canada, Australia, and South Africa, the propriety of abolishing those bounties.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): All the colonies named are large importers of sugar, and their exports are inappreciable. No representations of the kind suggested appear necessary.

Colonial Representative Institutions.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay Papers showing the methods in each case by which representative institutions have been conferred upon British Colonies since the accession of the late Queen Victoria, whether by Letters Patent or by statutory enactment.

MR. LYTTELTON: If the hon. Member will move for a Return, I shall be prepared to give it.

Chinese in the Transvaal—Secret Societies.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has any information relating to the reported arrest of thirty-two Chinamen on the Simmer and Jack Mine on the charge of forming a secret society; whether the society was in the nature of a trade union; and what punishment was inflicted.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not received information as to this reported occurrence, but I am making inquiry.

MR. WHITLEY: I will furnish the right hon. Gentleman with the report on which the Question is based, as he appears to be very late in getting information.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Is there anything in the terms of employment which makes it illegal for these men to join a secret society?

[No Answer was returned.]

Reciprocity Treaty between America and Cuba—Effect on British Trade.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has any reply been received from the United States Government to the representations which had been made by His Majesty's Government in February, 1903, as to the injurious effect upon British trade and upon the sugar industries in the West Indies, of the Reciprocity Treaty between the United States and the Government of Cuba; if so, can he say what was the nature of that reply; and when will the correspondence be laid upon the Table of the House.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): Representations were made to the Government of the United States in 1903 with regard to the injury that might result to British trade from the operation of the Reciprocity Treaty, but not with regard to its effect upon the trade of the West Indies, as these colonies cannot claim the benefits of the Commercial Treaty of 1815. The representations made by His Majesty's Government were unsuccessful owing to the view which, as my hon. friend is aware, the Government of the United States has frequently expressed that a treaty right to the most-favoured-nation treatment does not entitle its possessor to participate in special privileges granted to others in return for reciprocal concessions.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the noble Lord lay the correspondence on the Table?

*EARL PERCY: I am not sure that this correspondence is very important, but in regard to the question generally I will consider what can be done. There was a Paper containing the views of the United States Government on the subject laid in 1885.

Papers on Macedonia.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the later despatches of the Secretary of State since August to foreign countries, especially to France, Italy, and Austria relating to Macedonia and the necessary reforms, will be presented shortly to Parliament.

EARL PERCY: It is impossible to lay Papers relating to negotiations which are still in progress, but any information which can be made public will be presented without delay.

MR. CHANNING: Will the despatches in question be found inconsistent with the noble Lord's speech the other night?

EARL PERCY: I do not think the hon. Member will find any inconsistency, but he had better wait till the despatches are laid.

French Public Works—Foreign-made Material Excluded.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is he aware of an Amendment to the Budget Law, 1905, which is being presented in the French Chamber of Deputies, and which would have the effect of excluding absolutely and entirely, from all public works to be executed by the French Government or by the local authorities in France, every material not made entirely in France and solely of materials of French origin.

EARL PERCY: I have no information of the facts alleged, but I will make inquiry.

North Eastern Railway—Fatality at Backworth.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that, on the 20th instant, a young woman named Alice Maughan, residing at Felling, was found lying dead across the electrified rail on the North Eastern Railway Company's line near Backworth, Northumberland; and will he call for a report on the subject, and state whether the electrified rails on this line were passed by the Board of Trade inspector as sufficiently protected.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Yes, Sir. This accident was notified to the Board of Trade by the railway company, and the Board have appointed one of their inspecting officers to inquire into and report upon the circumstances. The arrangements for working this line by electricity have not been "passed" by the Board of Trade, the railway company having adopted the new method of traction on their own responsibility and without obtaining specific statutory powers involving preliminary inspection on behalf of the Board. The precautions adopted for the protection of the company's servants and the public have, however, come under the observation of the Board's officers when holding inquiries into previous similar accidents on this "electrified" line, and the company have informed the Board that they have complied with the recommendations made in the officers' reports on those accidents. I shall be happy to supply the hon. Member with a copy of the report.

Irish Land Stock.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the amount of the loss that will be involved by the repayment at par of the two recent issues of Irish Land Stock at a discount; and is any provision being made in the Estimates for a sinking fund to meet the loss when repayment falls due.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The two issues of guaranteed 2¾ per cent. stock, amounting to £11,000,000, are expected to yield cash to a total amount of £9,691,421 6s. 8d. The loss involved by a repayment at par would therefore be £1,308,578 13s. 4d. In accordance with Sections 36 and 47 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, annual provision to meet this difference is being made, partly out of the moneys of the guarantee fund and partly out of the annual Vote for the Land Commission.

MR. WHITLEY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what the annual payments are on these issues?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I must ask for notice of that Question.

South African Railways.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he has received payment of the £1,250,000 due from the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies on account of the railways handed over to them at the close of the war; and, if not, what steps he is taking in the matter.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In accordance with an agreement entered into by His Majesty's Government and the Colonial Governments, a lump sum of about £1,450,000 will be handed over by the Crown Agents in satisfaction of all claims (including that on account of the Railways), which the Home Government may have against the Colonies; and the payment of the bulk of the money will be made almost immediately.

MR. WHITLEY: Is the money to be raised by a loan?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. When I used the words "in satisfaction of all claims" I meant all claims of the character referred to by the hon. Member. It has nothing to do with the War Contribution Loan.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): Will this money be paid out of the £35,000,000 loan?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Will the hon. Gentleman be good enough to ask the Colonial Secretary? The matter is more within his knowledge and sphere of influence than mine. All that I am concerned to know is that the money is to be paid, and that the British Exchequer will receive it.

MR. WHITLEY: Does the right hon. Gentleman mean that this sum is in satisfaction only of all claims in connection with the railways?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. It includes the claims with respect to the railways, and other claims for such things as stocks and stores supplied.

MR. WHITLEY: What is the total amount of the claims that have been compounded for this sum?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I must ask for notice of that Question.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Will the right hon. Gentleman present Papers showing the particulars?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I will consider that, if I cannot give all the necessary information in answer to an unstarred Question.

London Telephone System.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will state what progress has been made with the establishment of the London telephone system, and the annual amount payable by subscribers for rentals at the termination of last year.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Eleven Post Office Telephone Exchanges had been opened in the London Area on December 31st last, and the number of subscribers' telephones working in connection with them was 22,181. The amount of the annual rentals payable for the use of these instruments, and of the message fees received during the year 1904, was £156,485.

Van Accidents in the Metropolis.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state how the number of accidents with covered vans in the streets of the metropolis since the introduction of the new by-law on the 1st May last compares with the corresponding period for the previous year.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I could not give the figures for the exact periods mentioned in the Question without special inquiry, but the figures for the year 1904 were 1,389 accidents, of which thirty-four were fatal, as against 1,425 in 1903, of which twenty-nine were fatal. It has to be remembered, however, that the by-law was not in operation during the first four months of 1904.

North Sea Fisheries Investigation.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether Papers showing the result of the North Sea Fisheries Investigation will be laid upon the Table.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): No Papers showing the results of the International Investigation can yet be presented, as the investigation is still going on. The reports showing the share taken by this country in the work, as far as it has gone, will shortly be laid upon the Table.

Equivalent Grant in the Highland Crofting Counties.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether he is aware that the Government grant known as the Equivalent Grant has hitherto been devoted by county councils in the Highland crofting counties in the relief of district road rates and the construction and maintenance of works of public utility such as footpaths, and will provision be made in the Education (Scotland) Bill exempting the crofting counties from the operation of any clause designed to deprive county councils of the power of determining the disposal of money at present received under the Equivalent Grant.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): The Secretary for Scotland is aware of the facts as stated, but cannot make any declaration in anticipation of the Education (Scotland) Bill which will shortly be introduced.

Culloden Estate Leaseholders and the Crofters Act.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland has now received a copy of resolutions unanimously adopted at a recent meeting of crofter leaseholders and other tenants on the Culloden Estate, in the Ferintosh district of Ross-shire, deploring the continued exclusion of leaseholders from the benefits of the Crofters Act, and urging that all tenants whose rents do not exceed £30 per annum should receive the benefits of the Act; and will he state what action it is proposed to take in the matter.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The Secretary for Scotland is indebted to the hon. Member for a copy of the resolutions referred to, but he does not feel under any obligation to take action in this matter.

Watergrasshill Prosecutions.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that at the Castletown Berehaven Petty Sessions some time ago a number of men charged with riot, assaulting the sheriff, and unlawful assembly, were tried and dealt with summarily; that two resident magistrates adjudicated in the cases; that Mr. Henry Wright, who prosecuted in the Watergrasshill cases, also prosecuted at Castletown Berehaven; and, seeing that he did not then object to the action of the magistrates, can he explain any difference in the cases tried at the petty sessions referred to.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The hon. Member is under a complete misapprehension. In the Castletown Berehaven case, the accused parties having expressed regret for what they had done and entered into recognisances to keep the peace and be of good behaviour, the Crown withdrew the prosecution. The magistrate did not adjudicate on any charge at all. In the Watergrasshill case the justices assembled in obedience to a Writ of Mandamus commanding them to adjudicate on the particular application before them, that was, to return the accused for trial or refuse to return them. This they did not do, but proceeded to adjudicate summarily on a charge not before them.

Duties of the Irish Board of Agriculture.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a feeling exists in county Longford and other parts of Ireland that such alterations should be made in the powers and duties of the Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction as would enable them to deal with questions of drainage, afforestation, and other public works; and will he consider the advisability of introducing a short amending Bill in this direction.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The Department has already taken steps for the development of forestry. It has acquired lands with a view to the establishment of a school of forestry and the carrying out of operations in forestry. It would not, however, be practicable for the Department, with the funds at its disposal, to embark on any extensive scheme of afforestation. With regard to arterial drainage, the Department has no funds at its disposal for undertaking works of this character. I cannot give any pledge to introduce legislation such as suggested.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Could not the money now spent in technical instruction be devoted to better purposes?

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): In what part of Ireland is there a school of forestry?

Mr. ATKINSON: I must ask for notice of any further Questions.

Irish Land Purchase Inspectors.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how many inspectors have been appointed under the Land Purchase Act, 1903, the religion, nationality, addresses, and previous experience of those officials, and in whom the appointments are vested.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): The Government has no knowledge of the religion or nationality of these inspectors, and cannot undertake to make inquiry in the matter. A Return is in preparation, however, and will shortly be laid on the Table, giving information as to the names and qualifications of these officers in the form of Parliamentary Paper, No. 151, of the session of 1902.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Will the Return also include the names of the surveyors?

Mr. ATKINSON: I think not.

Strabane Teachers' Association's Resolution.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Strabane Teachers' Association, at Strabane, on January 21st, 1905; and, if so, whether any steps have been or will be taken to redress the grievances of the national school teachers in Ireland as respectfully demanded in that resolution.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): The resolution has been received. The question of the allocation in Ireland of the amount provided as an equivalent of the aid grant for education in England has been frequently discussed in this House. My right hon. friend has no further statement to make in the matter at present.

Irish Agricultural Department—Catholic Clerks in the Veterinary Branch.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the fact that it has been alleged that the Catholic clerks in the Veterinary Branch of the Irish Agricultural Department had repeated in a communication to the secretary in May last several misstatements of fact, he will obtain specific instances of the misstatements contained in the communication in question.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): This is a matter affecting the internal discipline of the Department, with which it is competent to deal, and I see no necessity for asking the Department to furnish the information referred to. I must refer to the reply given on August 4th last by my right hon. friend to a similar Question† of the hon. Member.

Newry—Warrant against H. J. Livingstone.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if a warrant is in existence for the arrest of H. J. Livingstone of Newry; and, if so, under what circumstances it was issued, and for what reason its execution has been suspended, seeing that the authorities are in possession of his present address.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): A warrant was issued on the information on oath of one Michael Fearon, who alleged that Livingstone had, as executor of his (Fearon's) father, embezzled and misapplied part of the assets. On further investigation it was ascertained that there was no evidence whatever forthcoming to sustain the charge, and in consequence the warrant has not been executed.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxix., 995.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Did this man embezzle the funds and by whose authority was the warrant suspended? Who stopped the execution of the warrant?

Mr. ATKINSON: The Crown did.

Mr. MACVEAGH: On what ground?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question on the Paper has been answered.

Irish Butter Frauds in British Markets.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the frauds constantly being practised in England and other countries in articles of Irish manufacture, especially in Irish butter, with injury to their sale, he will take steps to have an inspector or inspectors appointed in connection with the Department of Agriculture in Ireland to look after and protect Irish industries in British markets.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): The Department has already on its staff a number of inspectors who devote constant attention to the matter mentioned in the Question. These officers at intervals visit different centres in Great Britain. It is not at present proposed to appoint an inspector who would permanently reside in England. This matter was fully dealt with at the last meeting of the Council of Agriculture held on February 9th.

Alleged United Irish League Outrages at Dingle.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the treatment to which Bridget Moran, of Dingle, county Kerry, has been subjected by the local branch of the United Irish League for eighteen months, and to the fact that her house has been maliciously burnt and her stock destroyed because, when the middle lease of her premises expired and her immediate landlord refused to pay the increase demanded by the head landlord, she, to save herself from eviction, took a lease of the premises at the rent which was demanded from her immediate landlord; and, if so, will he state what steps he has taken or will take in the matter.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): It is true that Mrs. Moran took a lease from the head landlord substantially under the circumstances mentioned. Disputes subsequently arose owing to Mrs. Moran having employed a man named McGuire, who was not a regular tradesman, to knock down and rebuild her house. It is alleged that the United Irish League subsequently interfered in this trade dispute. Mrs. Moran's house was subsequently burned down. She applied to the County Court Judge for compensation for malicious injury, and his decision in her favour is now under appeal. Under the circumstances I cannot go more fully into the facts. The police have at all times been giving close attention to the case and doing everything in their power to preserve the peace.

Irish Officials as Handwriting Experts.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the terms of the censure passed on T. P. Nolan by Mr. Justice Kenny, in the course of the trial of the Aungier Street Post Office case in Dublin, on February 17th; whether, seeing that Mr. Nolan was examined on behalf of the Crown in the prosecution of the staff of the *Irish People* newspaper in September, 1902, and that he is a Civil servant, he will say whether there are any special terms or conditions attached to his appointment permitting him to devote part of his time to his official duties and part to testifying as an expert in handwriting; whether he receives any remuneration for evidence given as to handwriting, and whether any deduction is made from his pay as a Civil servant for time thus occupied; and whether it is proposed to continue his services in the dual capacity.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): I have seen a newspaper report of the observations of the Judge, but am unable to say whether it is accurate. The reply to the second inquiry is in the affirmative, Dr. Nolan is employed as a clerk in the Department of the Local Government Board. The only regulation bearing on the subject of his employment, so far as I am aware, is one which prohibits a Civil servant from accepting any part in the management of any society, or any trading, commercial, or financial company, which would require his attendance at any time between the hours of 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. Dr. Nolan is required to devote his entire time to the services of the Department from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. or such later hour as may be necessary, except during his annual vacation or leave of absence. No deduction is made from his salary when he is absent on leave.

MR. MACVEAGH: What right has an official who is supposed to serve the country in the Local Government Board from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. to go up and down the country giving evidence at trials?

MR. ATKINSON: The whole question is under consideration.

Kerry Fair Rent Appeals.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that county Kerry appeals before the Chief Land Commission to have fair rents fixed, which have been lodged five years ago, are still unheard; and whether, in view of this state of affairs, steps will be taken to have the cases heard, and the fair rents determined.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The last list of fair rent appeals heard in the county Kerry contained all cases in which the appeals were lodged prior to May 1st, 1901. A sitting for the hearing of further appeals from the county has been provisionally arranged to be held at Killarney on the 27th of next June.

Trinity College Tenantry.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the Commission appointed to inquire into the relations between Trinity College and their tenants will make their Report; and whether, when the Report is made, it will be issued as a Parliamentary Paper for the information and use of Members of the House.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The Commissioners hope to complete their Report before the end of the month. The question of issuing the Report as a Parliamentary Paper will be considered when it has been received.

White Estate, Bantry.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. W. Guest Lane, a land agent, has been appointed by the Estates Commissioners to inquire into the cases of the evicted tenants on the White Estate, near Bantry; and whether, in view of the attitude of this gentleman towards some of the tenants, and the fact that he stated to one tenant named James Leary that the man who had taken his farm and resided on it for twenty-three years had the best right to it, he will advise that another inspector be sent on the estate referred to.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The hon. Member has not been correctly informed. The firm of Messrs. Guest, Lane and Co., to which the Question presumably refers, are the solicitors having carriage of the estate and are not in the employment of the Commissioners.

Irish Model School Fees.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state when the Treasury first demanded any and what portion of the school fees collected from the pupils in Irish model schools, and on what grounds was that demand made; what proportion of these fees went to the Treasury and what proportion to the teachers; are these fees in the nature of local aid to education; and what is the total amount of these fees which the Treasury has obtained from the date of their first demand to March 31st, 1904.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The model schools have been established out of funds provided by Parliament. In 1868 the amount of fees received from pupils in excess of the emoluments of the teaching staff was paid into the Imperial Exchequer. In 1876 an arrangement was made with the Treasury by which a sum of £2,000 per annum became payable to the Exchequer out of these fees, the surplus, if any, being distributable among the teachers. In recent years, however, the fees collected have not reached the sum of £2,000. The payment into the Exchequer is shown in the Annual Estimates as an Appropriation in Aid of the Vote for Public Education. The total amount of the Appropriations in Aid so realised to March 31st, 1904, is £62,447.

Department of Agriculture—Staff.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in a recent interview with the chief clerk of the Department of Agriculture an attempt was made to induce one of the Catholic clerks of the Veterinary Branch to dissociate himself from the statements made in a joint memorandum addressed to the secretary in May last, setting forth grievances under which he and certain other Catholic gentlemen laboured; whether, with that avowed intention and with the stated object of removing this clerk from his colleagues and co-signatories, he was forthwith transferred to the Fisheries Branch of the Department; and whether he will state what steps he proposes taking to secure that these clerks shall not in future be interfered with in bringing under the Department's notice the disabilities from which they suffer.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): On January 7th the chief clerk verbally communicated to the member of the staff referred to the order of the Department, already determined upon, transferring him to the Fisheries Branch. In the course of conversation with this officer the chief clerk suggested to him the unwisdom of continuing to participate in a line of action that had been censured by the Department. This advice was tendered in the most friendly manner and was in no way dependent on the order of the Department transferring the clerk to another branch of the office. The Department is at all times ready to give sympathetic consideration to the legitimate claims of members of its staff, and there is no foundation for the suggestion that it has acted to the detriment of its officers.

Currygranny Postal Arrangements.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the complaint of Mr. Geelan, of Currygranny, county Longford, that, in consequence of the refusal of the Post Office authorities to deliver his letters from the Newtownforbes office, he does not receive his correspondence till 11.30 o'clock in the morning, whilst the postman from Newtownforbes passes his gate at 9 a.m.; and will he now direct a delivery to Currygranny from Newtownforbes instead of from Johnston's Bridge as at present.

LORD STANLEY: I have had inquiry made on this subject, and I find that it is only when a bog can be crossed by the postman from Newtownforbes that he passes near Mr. Geelan's house. To extend his delivery regularly to that house and other neighbouring houses would involve additional expense which, I regret to say, I should not be justified in authorising.

Edgeworthstown Parcels Delivery.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he has directed that a mid-day parcel delivery take place in Edgeworthstown immediately after the arrival of the mid-day trains at that town.

LORD STANLEY: I am glad to say that it has been found practicable to arrange for a parcel delivery at Edgeworthstown at about mid-day. The service will begin in a few days.

Drumglass School, Dungannon.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if any, and if so what, progress has been made with the preparation of the revised plans for Drumglass School at Dungannon, county Tyrone; how many draughtsmen have been employed in making the necessary drawings; and what is the difficulty they have encountered which has made it impossible for them to make a simple plan for an ordinary national school in two years.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: This case is delayed pending the decision on the question of the general revision of the estimates for national schools. Steps are being taken to expedite a settlement of the matter.

Lord Milner.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Lord Milner has resigned or intends to resign.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have said before that Lord Milner said long ago, to the Government's great regret, that he could not go on.

NEW BILLS.

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

"To amend the Public Health Acts," presented by Sir Alfred Hickman; supported by Sir Albert Rollit, Sir Thomas Wrightson, and Sir James Heath; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 15th March, and to be printed. [Bill 71.]

PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACTS (EXTENSION) BILL.

"To extend the Public Libraries Acts to counties," presented by Sir James Rankin; supported by Mr. Bryce, Mr. Kenyon, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Samuel Evans, and Mr. Bull; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 12th April, and to be printed. [Bill 72.]

ACCIDENTS (MINES AND FACTORIES) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Returns and Notification of Accidents in Mines, Quarries, Factories, and Workshops," presented by Mr. Cochrane; supported by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas and Mr. Bonar Law; to be read a second time upon Friday, 10th March, and to be printed. [Bill 73.]

GOVERNMENT SHIPS BILL.

"To make provision with respect to Ships which belong to His Majesty, or are held on behalf of or for the benefit of the Crown, but do not form part of His Majesty's Navy," presented by Mr. Pretyman; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 74.]

NAVAL LANDS (VOLUNTEERS) BILL.

"To extend the Military Lands Acts to Naval and Marine Volunteers," presented by Mr. Pretyman; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 75.]

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question [14th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Mount.*)

Question again proposed.

*MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire E.), in moving the Amendment to the Address which stood in his name, said it might be suggested that his Motion was a very wide one and that it was by no means a new one. He admitted it was impossible for any one in his position to do more than touch upon the main features of his subject. It was not a new Motion in substance, because the subject was not a new one, but in these days it was necessary to continually repeat the views it was desired to advance in order to enforce them on the public mind. He should, therefore, make no apology if, during the course of his remarks, he dealt with subjects which had been debated on previous occasions. He hoped he would not be met with the argument, or rather with the excuse that it would be better to wait till the Estimates were presented.

He would have been very glad indeed had the Estimates for the current year been before them, because that would have facilitated his task. But it was well known that such a Motion as he had on the Paper could not be discussed on the proposition that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair on any branch of the Estimates, and, therefore, no opportunity would arise for him on going into Committee of Supply. Anyone who chose to read his Amendment would recognise that it raised the question of the past policy and expenditure of the Government during the many years they had been in office, rather than particular details of its present policy and still less of its future policy. The Prime Minister had suggested why not wait for the Budget in order to discuss those points. No doubt, on the Budget, the general financial policy of the Government could be raised. But he would like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer were they to have a Budget this year? Were they sure that Parliament would continue in session till the Budget was presented? Further, it was obvious to anyone who considered the political situation that the Budget for the present year would be in its main features a dissolution Budget, and the attention of the House, therefore, would be concentrated upon details rather than upon general principles, and, of course, the most interesting question at that time would be the future financial policy of the Government. His Amendment really dealt with a question of a wider character, which was eminently suited to the occasion of an Amendment to the Address, because it impugned, or was meant to practically impugn, the whole trend of the financial policy of the Government and of the Party opposite during the five or ten years they had been responsible for the financial interests of the country. This had been one of the subjects very largely debated in the country during the past two years. It had held a very prominent place indeed in the discussions which had gone on at various by-elections, and he believed that hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House would be wanting in their duty if they did not take that, the first opportunity, of bringing it under discussion in the House of Commons.

Now he came to the subject-matter of his Amendment. What were the main counts of the indictment against the Government? They were these—(1) the general question of the excessive increase of expenditure; (2) as a consequence, the increased burden on the people, the increase of taxation, bringing with it distress, depression of trade, depreciation of capital, and many other consequences in its train; (3) the laxity of financial methods, which had become the practice of the Government; and (4) the reckless piling up of debt year after year, utterly irrespective of the consequences, and without any due or adequate provision for its discharge.

With regard to the first count, the excessive increase of national expenditure, it was confessed in all quarters of the House and generally throughout the country, and the figures on the subject were quite familiar to them all. They knew that since 1898 the net revenue of the country had gone up from £90,000,000 to £140,000,000. These figures were taken from what was known as the "Fowler" Return, and he was simply quoting round figures. The growth had been enormous, and was absolutely without a parallel in our past political and financial history. Let them look at the previous decennial periods 1874–84 and 1884–94. They would find that the decennial increase was in one case £13,000,000 and in the other £11,000,000, whereas during the last decennial period the expenditure of the country had gone up by no less than £50,000,000. They knew that the great increase had been in naval and military expenditure. Again he would take the figures from the "Fowler" Return, although that Return did not give the full amount of our naval and military expenditure. In 1894–5 our naval and military expenditure amounted to £35,000,000. In 1903–4 it had gone up to £71,000,000; it had more than doubled. Let them compare that with the expenditure in preceding decennial periods. Between 1874–84 the increase was £6,000,000, between 1884–94 it was £5,000,000; but between 1894 and 1903 the increase was £36,000,000. That was to say, that while formerly this branch of our expenditure had increased at the rate of £500,000 per annum, it was now increasing at the rate of no less than £4,000,000 annually.

Surely that amply justified his first contention that our expenditure had been excessive in its character, and that the rate of increase had been too great. It was quite obvious that any such increase of expenditure could not possibly be met by any ordinary growth of revenue. The Party opposite during their tenure of office had had, one might fairly say, five fat years and five comparatively lean years. During the first five years they were in office they had large surpluses, the taxes were yielding more year after year, and the revenue was increasing by leaps and bounds. Indeed, the ordinary increase of revenue was unexampled during the first three or four years the Government were in office; it was an increase of something like £9,000,000 in the automatic expansion of ordinary revenue. They also inherited from their predecessors in office something like £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 extra revenue from the death duties introduced by Sir William Harcourt. Thus they had this great advantage, that during their first four years of office they had an expanding and increasing revenue—increasing at a rate unexampled in our previous financial history. Then, undoubtedly, a change began to come over the scene. About the year 1900 the taxes ceased to be buoyant; they became almost stationary; the yield for each penny of income-tax, which had been steadily rising from £2,000,000 to £2,500,000, became stationary in 1901. In the same way, in another branch of our revenue, the consumption of tea, which also had been steadily increasing year by year, gradually became stationary, and now it was actually showing symptoms of declining. As they were all aware, other important articles from a taxation point of view—beer and spirits—were no longer so elastic and so remunerative as they had been.

Without going into details he would ask—what would have been a prudent course for any Government to pursue under these circumstances? What would have been the ordinary prudent course for a private individual if the same fortune had befallen him? Surely a man in commercial business who suddenly found his profits largely increasing would have recognised that in business there were ups and downs and that large increases of profits were not likely to continue perpetually. He would have shown his wisdom by not spending every farthing of his increased profits, but would have endeavoured to keep something for a rainy day. He would have paid off any mortgages on the business and would not have immediately and permanently increased his regular expenditure. But what had the Government and the Party opposite done? They had done exactly the reverse. Mainly under the leadership, not of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, but of one of his predecessors the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, it had spent every sixpence of revenue that had come in in these times of prosperity, and it had spent more than had come in. Instead of making a substantial and special effort to reduce debt they had increased the national establishments and permanently added to our scale of expenditure. They had gone to work as if the good times were to continue for ever. But then came the war. He did not propose to discuss the policy of the war, to which he was opposed, for that was not the proper occasion. All he would deal with were the financial effects of the war. This House and the country undoubtedly raised a large amount of money for the war, both by taxation and by loans. They responded freely to the call, notwithstanding there had been bad miscalculations—financial as well as military and political — miscalculations which they overlooked. Surely under these circumstances they had some claim for consideration at the hands of the Government. They had a right to say, "While we pay this large extra expenditure and while we bear these heavy extra burdens the Government should take care that our ordinary expenditure should not at the same time be continually increasing." Was that done? Not a bit of it. The expenditure, apart from the war, went on increasing during the war at an even greater rate than previously to the war, and now that the war had been concluded for more than two years the people were waking up to find that the new taxes, put on primarily and ostensibly for war purposes, and intended only to be of a temporary character, were permanently saddled upon their shoulders for peace purposes. Even worse was their fate last year, when the present Chancellor of the Exchequer not only retained the increased taxes, but added to them.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I replaced part of the taxation which had been taken off.

*MR. BUCHANAN said he thought that when the war ended the people of this country would have been prepared to continue the great bulk of the war taxation for a certain period on certain conditions. They had a right to expect when the war came to an end that those responsible for the finances of the country should lay before the House of Commons some scheme for effectively reducing the burdens which had been imposed in consequence of it; that they should have a real systematic and well thought out proposal for diminishing the burdens of war debt and taxation. But no such proposal was made either by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer or his predecessor, with perhaps one exception, the promise of £30,000,000 from the Transvaal, which probably never would be received.

He had already pointed out that in the prosperous years the Government did not pay their way. That brought him to the third branch of his indictment—the lax methods of the finance they had introduced. There were many such new methods, he would deal with only one, viz.:—the evil practice of supplementary budgets for naval and military purposes, which had enabled them to obtain large sums of money over which officials of the spending Departments had extra wide powers, and of which the House of Commons, as representatives of the people, had little knowledge, and still less control. They had borrowed money for expenditure which should have been met out of revenue, and by so doing they had thrown part of the burden of our own extravagance on the shoulders of the coming generation. He was, of course, referring to their policy in dealing with naval and military works by a system of Loan Bills — a policy which was being extended to other branches of our administration. He quite recognised that such a policy might be defensible, and was, indeed, defensible on special occasions and for special emergencies. Indeed, when the question was raised, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer always turned round and sought to close their mouths by quoting the precedent of the Naval Works Act of Lord Spencer in 1895. But the gravamen of the charge now was that that which might have been defensible or justifiable on a special occasion had now become an established and growing practice in our finance. Military and Naval Works Acts were regularly introduced every two years. They had added about £5,000,000 to our annual naval and military expenditure, and up to the present, something like £25,000,000 to our debt, an addition which was likely to become £50,000,000 or £60,000,000 if all the schemes embodied in these Acts were carried out. But the loans had been so entirely diverted from the purposes for which they were originally intended as to have become mere additions to Army and Navy expenditure. When these Bills were first introduced, the noble Lord the Member for Ealing and Sir William Harcourt made a great point that if they were defensible at all they should be for special defence and permanent works to be completed within a limited time and cost. All these limitations had gone by the board. There was an even worse development, for, instead of being used for permanent works alone, money was being raised by loan for dredging and electric lighting, which surely ought not to be treated as capital expenditure. That was to say, under the Works Acts of 1901 and 1903, the money borrowed was no longer applied to specific works of a large and definite character, but to general objects of naval utility, which, according to sound principles of finance, should be provided for in the annual Estimates. The schedule of the Military Works Act was even worse. Various military works in connection with the Army reform schemes of the past, now condemned, were paid for under a Loans Act without the knowledge of the people of this country. Grants for Volunteer ranges for sums as small as £4 or £6 were not paid for outright and charged to revenue, but the money was borrowed and repayment spread over thirty years. Was that a sound financial policy for a rich country like this? The system was absurd and wasteful, and took away the control of expenditure from the House of Commons and the country. This was practically the view of the Public Accounts Committee, who last year reported on the subject in these words—

> "Your Committee entertain serious doubts as to the financial method by which naval works are provided for by means of loans. The same remark applies, of course, to military and other similar loan services. For special works of permanent character and large cost, it may, as an exceptional measure, be desirable to provide by loan, repayable within a limited number of years. But the resort of such procedure should be the exception and not the rule. In recent years annual and biennial Military and Naval Works Acts have become a regular part of the military and naval finance. Your Committee would deprecate the continuance of this practice. They believe that it would be more in accordance with sound rules of finance, and would tend to simplify the national accounts and maintain an efficient control over expenditure, if the bulk of these services were included, as formerly, in the annual Estimates."

That was good sound commonsense and good finance, and he hoped that the views thus expressed would before long be adopted by the Government of this country.

The fourth count of the indictment he would leave subsequent speakers to develop. It was the reckless piling up of debt by the Government, and the absence of any real attempt to reduce it. When they came into power in 1895 the floating debt was £8,000,000, now it was over £80,000,000. All the debt reductions of the past thirty years had gone for nought, our funded debt had gone back to about the same figure as in 1880, and, so far from making any substantial reduction of the debt, we were increasing it. The discharge of debt which we professed to make by means of Sinking Funds and Terminable Annuities was more than counterbalanced by the creation of new debt under the Naval and Military Works Acts.

And now as to the cause of all this. There was an old quotation from Mr. Disraeli, "Expenditure depends on policy." That was a fundamental principle of politics, but there was one thing more expensive than a new policy, and that was a perpetual changing of policy. They could find many instances in the history of the present Government of the way in which our financial burdens had been increased both by new policies and by changes of policy. The Agricultural Rating Act, the endowment of church schools, the Tithe Rent Charge Act, the Licensing Act, and Irish Legislation, all these increased the burdens of the people and left an indelible mark on the finances of the country. And what about our foreign and colonial policy? In South Africa we had 20,000 British soldiers to maintain at an extra expense of something like £2,000,000 per annum as compared with some 5,000 before the war. Did the Government intend permanently to keep that large body of troops there at our expense? Besides that we were spending in South Africa over £3,000,000 in providing permanent barrack accommodation. That was a striking comment on our expressed desire to give the new colonies representative, and eventually responsible, government. If a generous measure of representative and responsible government were promptly given it would do much to reconcile them to their position, and would, if they were made responsible for their own defence, save large amounts to the Exchequer of this country. Look elsewhere in Africa. The then Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1897 complained that at that date there was an increased charge of £1,000,000 per annum on the Exchequer for Central East and West Africa. Since 1897 that charge had more than doubled. In reply to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean the Prime Minister in March of last year told them that the Colonial Office had an army of 17,000 men, the Foreign Office 4,000, all mainly in Africa, and the charge for these two military forces, outside the control of the War Office, and borne by the Civil Service Estimates, amounted to over £2,000,000 per annum. This was a new charge since the Party opposite came into power, and here there was distinctly room for retrenchment.

Again, a very interesting table was given annually in the Army Estimates showing the number of men serving outside the United Kingdom, but not in India. That meant the men in the Colonies and Egypt. A comparison of the number now as compared with ten years ago gave some remarkable results. In the early nineties there were in round figures 37,000 men serving outside the United Kingdom, and the cost was between £2,000,000 and £2,500,000. According to last year's Estimates there were 72,000, and the cost was within £1,000 of £6,000,000. Of course, that included the garrison in South Africa, but it would be found that this was an increase all over. Surely that was due largely to the policy pursued during the past ten years by the Government. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would say "Oh! We are going to remedy all that, or a good part of it." Some interesting information had been lately given by the Secretary for the Colonies that the defences of Halifax and Esquimault were going to be taken over by the Canadian Government. It was a step in the right direction. That was a form of colonial help of Imperial expenditure of which he highly approved, much better than begging for naval contributions from the Colonies. Another important statement was made with regard to Bermuda and the West Indian garrisons. The garrison of Bermuda was to be diminished, roughly speaking, by a half, some changes were to be made at Jamaica, and the St. Lucia garrison was to be withdrawn altogether. The garrison in Barbadoes was also to be withdrawn. So far so good. But how did this illustrate the point about expenditure being dependent upon changes of policy. What had we been doing in all these places right up to the present year? We had been spending money hand over hand in all these places on permanent military and naval works, and we were not going to get a penny back from the Canadian Government or the West Indian Colonies. From the figures given by the Financial Secretary with regard to Bermuda, Jamaica, St. Lucia, and Halifax, we had spent £2,000,000 in the past ten years, and of that sum more than half was spent in the last three years. Expenditure had been going on there during the current year up to the very moment of this change of policy. Whilst he for one welcomed the change he thought it showed a certain want of consistency of purpose and a want of thinking out the military and strategic problems before us, and that had made us go so far in the wrong direction. If this was thinking Imperially, which was so often recommended, he would say "Heaven preserve the finances of the country," because it was clear that the cultivation of that particular form of thought was one which cost the pockets of the people of this country very dear indeed.

In connection with the change of policy in the Navy it was announced that 130 ships were to be knocked out of the active list. Many of these ships were reckoned in the present year as fit for war purposes, and were repaired and refitted at considerable cost during the present and immediately preceding years; and yet with all their repairs recently completed they were to be sent to the Clyde to be sold as scrap iron. They had always been told that they might have confidence in the sagacity and foresight of the naval administration of the country. Here was a sudden change in naval policy which would certainly entail a considerable loss of public money. That shook their confidence. He would defer what he had to say on that subject until they got fuller statistics upon it.

They were told that the Prime Minister was a very skilful strategist, and they knew he was a Parliamentary strategist. He admired the strategical way in which the right hon. Gentleman treated this subject when speaking in Glasgow. The right hon. Gentleman described this policy as a "courageous stroke of the pen," but in so saying he knew he was confessing to the utter want of foresight on the part of the Government of which he had been a leading member for many years. That might be good strategy for a public meeting, but it was cold comfort for the taxpayers of the country, who had to pay dearly for this change of policy on the part of the Government. It was the duty of the Opposition in the House and in the country to advocate that the spirit of economy should replace the spirit of expenditure and extravagance which had so long prevailed in the spending Departments, in Parliament, and in the nation. No doubt the distress, the depression in trade, the fall in Consols and other securities, and the pressure of taxation had brought home to the people that they had been spending far too much, and that they must needs call a halt. In the last speech which the late Sir William Harcourt delivered, the advice which he gave to that Assembly and the country was that in this rapid growth of expenditure and reckless career of extravagance it was time to call a halt. If it was time then it was still more so now. They might not be able to do anything very heroic or very speedily, for they knew that there were commitments for the future put on their shoulders by the Government which were very heavy indeed, and would take a considerable time to work off, but there was no one in the Government, the House of Commons, or the country who did not believe that substantial reductions in our expenditure were possible and that the present moment was also favourable. The foreign outlook in this country was also favourable. He thought everybody allowed that the Army might be much reduced and the expenditure on it greatly lessened, and that this would contribute to its efficiency instead of impairing it. If they could not go back to the expenditure of ten years ago let them try to go back five years. What sufficed before the war surely ought to suffice now. In that way we should be able to diminish the war taxes, to lighten the burdens on industry, to improve our credit and take the most effective means to render the country prosperous and strong within and without. The final words of the Amendment were taken from a Motion moved by Mr. Gladstone in 1857, just before the dissolution of that year. A dissolution was impending then, and he supposed the Government would not deny that another was impending now. Mr. Gladstone said then, and he had tried to urge now, that these matters were of supreme importance to the welfare of the country and that they should be brought prominently before the judgment of the country at the general election, so that when the new Parliament came into being it and the Government which should represent its opinion should be irrevocably committed, after a full discussion before the nation, and with their approval, to a real retrenchment and a substantial reduction of our expenditure.

MR. GUEST (Plymouth) said that in rising to second the Amendment he wished to avoid anything in the nature of exaggeration. He quite admitted that they could not expect that the expenditure of the country would remain stationary from year to year. There was the consideration of growth of population alone which must lead to a legitimate increase in our public expenditure. There was also the consideration of a rise in the scale of wages, which of course reacted upon remuneration the Government had to offer its employees and Civil servants, and the fact that the Government had undertaken many functions which previously they never dreamt of doing would also react upon the expenditure of the country. But the increase of which they complained could not be accounted for under these heads, and the balance could in no way be explained except upon the hypothesis that the Government had neglected their first duty, namely, the guardianship of the public purse. Taking the last decennial period, he found that the expenditure of the country had risen from £107,000,000 to £176,000,000, or very nearly an increase of £70,000,000 sterling. He arrived at the figure by including the receipts from borrowed monies under the Military Works Acts, interceptions from local taxation, and money for grants-in-aid. He had no doubt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would reply that to include these was to give a false impression as to what part of the revenue fell upon the taxpayers as a public burden. In comparing expenditure they must include these. With regard to the Debt, taking the unfunded debt and other debts, it had risen in that decennial period by no less than £127,000,000 sterling, and if to that they added other capital liabilities for which we were more or less contingently responsible and which had risen by £83,000,000, it was perfectly obvious that the capital liabilities of this country had increased in that period beyond anything that had ever been known before. He asserted that the expenditure of the country was disproportionate to the increase of population, to the growth of wealth, to fresh services rendered by the State, or indeed to the growth and development of national and Imperial responsibilities, or lastly, to the menace of foreign States. His hon. friend the Member for Exeter had given more than once figures to this House to prove that in all this expenditure along the road to ruin it was Great Britain that had always set the pace. If a French Minister or a German Chancellor wanted an argument or a lever to extract from the Reichstag or the Chambre a certain sum of money, it was always the ship-building programme of Great Britain that was pointed to. On the contrary they never heard in that House Votes defended on any comparative basis whatever.

Of course, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was responsible for this state of affairs, and he sometimes thought that the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was neither a very enviable one nor readily understood. Of course, in dealing with small sums of money he could settle them out of hand. There were Treasury Rules and Departmental practice to enable him to deal with these. But in the case of large sums of money the Chancellor of the Exchequer must depend certainly upon his Parliamentary position and reputation; and the sympathy and connection which subsisted between him and the Prime Minister, and not less, but to a far larger extent, upon the tone and temper of the House in regard to expenditure. Now, was it not rather a curious thing that side by side with this growth of expenditure of which they complained, there had been a weakening and a slackening of Parliamentary control? Take the question of appropriations-in-aid. Everybody was aware that these were entirely withdrawn from the purview of the House; and yet these appropriations-in-aid, regard them as they liked, were money actually expended in the current year, just as much as money derived from any other source. These appropriations-in-aid had increased from £6,000,000 in 1898 to £12,000,000 in 1903, or exactly double. Then there was the question to which his hon. friend had alluded and which was very important; he meant the Supplementary Estimates. It struck at the basis of the whole of Parliamentary control if the Government could budget by compartments. If a budget was brought in for some Departments at one part of the year and another for other Departments at another period it was perfectly clear that the control of the House over expenditure was weakened. Then there was the matter of the new rules. The Prime Minister very often took credit to himself that these new rules had had the effect of enlarging the discussions on the Estimates. He did not deny that there might have been some improvement in that respect, and that more time had been given to the consideration of the Estimates, but judged by the standard of economy he sometimes doubted whether this improvement had not insidiously deprived the House of an appropriate, though crude and effective weapon of checking Departmental expenditure. A sort of bargain which took place between the Opposition and the expenditure Departments might not have been very dignified, but, at any rate, it was very effective for its purpose, and there was not the least doubt that the dwindling and decline of the control over public expenditure was caused by the new rules.

As to the debt due to war there was not much to complain of in that part. There was, of course, the Funded Debt and the Unfunded Debt, and they differed in this respect, that whereas the Funded Debt had a sinking fund which automatically reduced it, the Unfunded Debt had no sinking fund. Although he believed the Unfunded Debt consisted of sums of money which fell due at short intervals of time, he believed that in practice they were renewed as they fell due. Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer reduce the £52,000,000 at which the Unfunded Debt stood in 1904? It had this in common with the Funded Debt, that they both depended upon a fixed annual charge for the payment of the interest which fell due, and so it was obvious that the increase of the Unfunded Debt was made at the expense of the extinguishing power of the Sinking Fund. When the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon made his Budget speech in 1903, he made an ingenious calculation by which he defended the fixing of the fixed charge for the Sinking Fund at £27,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman calculated the number of years under that *régime* which would elapse before the total debt of the country would be extinguished; but when he made the calculation he did not forsee the increase in the Unfunded Debt, and consequently the whole calculation was vitiated. At the time he made that calculation the Unfunded Debt was between £20,000,000 and £30,000,000 less than it was at the present day—a state of things which he could hardly have realised. The partial suspension of the Sinking Fund which had been made was doubly important as it affected the credit of the country. If they looked at the debt of the country over a period of years it would be found that credit varied inversely with the amount of debt. As the debt rose credit fell, and *vice versa.*

What was the origin of this state of affairs? He supposed that everybody would admit that it was the war which first revealed to the Party opposite the enormous treasure in this country, the collection of two generations of thrift and peace. The South African War had differed from other wars in so far that to-day we had forgotten thrift and indulged in prodigality, whereas the Napoleonic and Crimean Wars begat economy. The South African War had been used as an instrument to forward lavish designs. The fact was that we went into the South African War with a normal expenditure of £100,000,000, and came out of it with a normal expenditure of £140,000,000. Now, what was the explanation of this vast increase of expenditure? It was largely because we had in the Government men whose sole idea of statescraft was the spending of money. Was there any legislative or administrative difficulty, money was always forthcoming to meet it. If there was an educational hitch the Chancellor of the Exchequer came down and asked for a new fund. If Ireland demanded self-government the Government gave £13,000,000 to buy off the landlords' claims. If agricultural or clerical rates required relief, the public revenue was sacrificed to meet them. And what applied to legislation equally applied to finance. Take the £35,000,000 devoted to the necessities of South Africa. There was a bogus understanding that this £35,000,000 was only to be advanced on the condition that we were to obtain £30,000,000 of an indemnity. When were we going to see any of this £30,000,000 which was due two years ago? In fact, there was no single legislative or administrative act which did not involve some form of call on the public resources. This striking universality, he could not help feeling, was done on purpose. The spending of money conferred a sort of popularity. An open-handed man was generally popular, but he was a spendthrift. The Government had discovered that it was, on the whole, more popular to spend money on their friends than to incur the odium of the taxpayers by thrift and economy. When the discovery of the national wealth was made the Conservatives attempted to turn it to Party account. The murmurs of the taxpayers would have been drowned but for the inefficiency of administration. It was national exigencies that revealed the hoard of treasure; it was Party necessities that had dictated its lavish distribution. And if it had not been for inefficiency the pernicious waste would not have been revealed.

The important question for the House to consider was whether this expenditure could go on? He was inclined to say that the alacrity of the response with which both old and new taxation had been met was due rather to past immunity than to the bottomless resources of the taxpayers. But if it could go on, at any rate it could not go on at a rate of increase of £7,000,000 a year. It would not take much imagination to conceive that before many years were over that sort of thing would land us in national ruin. But even if they took their stand on the standard now reached, he thought, from what he had said, that it would be admitted that the question would arise. Where would the Chancellor of the Exchequer turn; from what new sources would he draw to meet this alarming increase in the national expenditure? They were told that the old sources of taxation were exhausted to the utmost, and that new sources must be discovered; that the basis of contribution must be broadened. Now, at this moment, most opportunely, proposals of protection came upon the scene. He thought that was a perfect windfall to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But it was a rather surprising circumstance, because what was the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? He needed indirect taxes, and he would have been more than human and less than filial had he not welcomed that fiscal reform which would automatically create them. On the other hand, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who wanted fiscal reform, would have been more than human and less than paternal if he had deplored that excessive expenditure which seemed to render indirect taxes a fiscal expedient. Stripped of Imperial finery, fiscal reform turned out to be nothing more than a fiscal expedient, a revenue device. But could any Member of the House suggest other alternatives to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which would be no less lucrative to him and would not increase the burdens on the poor, while providing a salutory lesson to the authors of this extravagance?

Now as to economy he was quite certain that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would indulge in the usual taunt of all Chancellors of the Exchequer, that, whereas expenditure had been deplored, no practical suggestions as to economies had been offered. Of the £70,000,000 increase, to which he had referred, no less than £50,000,000 was accounted for by naval and military armaments. As far as the Army was concerned, he had previously urged the advisability, the wisdom, and the practicability of reducing its expenditure; and now they had on the most eminent authority in this House, namely, the Secretary of State for War, the admission that the Army was the most costly machine ever devised by man. The right hon. Gentlemen's friend, General Turner, was not quite willing to go the length that the Secretary for State imagined he would; but he wrote to the papers to say that the expense of the Army was in inverse proportion to its utility. There was a ground upon which the Chancellor of the Exchequer could take his stand. The House, the country, the Government, the War Office all admitted that the Army was the most costly, expensive, and wasteful machine ever devised. Surely here was an opportunity for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to effect some reduction. But a far more remarkable thing had happened. They all knew that the Army was extravagant; but now they were told that the Navy was also extravagant. The Prime Minister went down to Glasgow and said that the Government proposed to reduce the Navy by no less than 140 ships, while adding to its fighting efficiency. Every year the Naval Estimates were presented in accordance with the dictates of the strictest economy; they were calculated by experts who compared ton for ton, and gun for gun, with the navies of two or three foreign Powers. These Estimates, the wisdom of which it would be folly to question, and some of the money for which it would be treason to refuse, were now, they were told, not to be relied on. Surely, here again there was an opportunity for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to effect economy. He admitted that this country was a rich country; but it contained a great many poor people. Perhaps in no other country in the world was the contrast between rich and poor so great. Taxation imposed for the war still remained, and deprived humble people of the small comforts of life. This year there was a fresh feature—the existence of a great extension of the unemployed. What was that due to? It could not be due to any ordinary depression or any falling-off in the oversea trade of the country, because never before had the import and export trade stood at such a high figure. What was the operative factor which had produced this new feature? Might it not be a restriction in enterprise on the part of the capitalists of this country owing to the excessive taxation to which they had been subjected for so long. The Government had gratified with a lavish hand all the greedy instincts and expensive vanities of their Party; they had piled up expenditure out of proportion to any standard, they had increased the burdens of the poor, restricted enterprise, depressed public credit and discouraged Parliamentary responsibility. Surely retrenchment had become a vital necessity in this country. Lord Burleigh once said that England would never be ruined except by Party. It would not be the fault of the Prime Minister if that ancestral prophesy remained unfulfilled.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the words—

"But humbly represent to Your Majesty that the increase in National Expenditure under Your Majesty's present advisers has been excessive, and has imposed heavy burdens on the people, for the relief of which it is urgently necessary that at the earliest moment the expenditure of the State should be revised and reduced." (*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter) said in the course of the interesting speech which had just been delivered the hon. Gentleman appeared to attribute all responsibility for the large increase in expenditure to the Government. He thought the hon. Gentleman struck a truer note earlier in his speech when he said that expenditure depended mainly on the tone and feeling of the House and the country. He had always deplored large and rapid increases of expenditure; but he recognised that the Government were the servants of the popular will and the exponents of a policy which had obtained popular support. He would say at the outset that Gentlemen who sat on the two front benches had not been as strong in the direction of economy as many private Members on both sides of the House would desire. The fact was that the burden of restricting expenditure had fallen to a very large extent on private Members. He exempted from any stricture the late Sir William Harcourt, who rendered such strenuous and admirable support to the cause of public economy. What he desired to hear from the Chancellor of the Exchequer was whether the description of the general state of the business of the country which was contained in the pamphlet issued by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, and which had alarmed all who followed the course of public finance, was accurate. He hoped to hear that the figures contained in that pamphlet were to a considerable extent exaggerated. Unless some statement of that kind could be made on official authority the position of the finances of this country was such as to constitute a national danger. He thought, therefore, the House would expect from the right hon. Gentleman a very clear statement upon the points brought forward by the hon. Member for King's Lynn. For years past they had been endeavouring to induce the Government to reduce expenditure, and they had always been met with the reply that while in the abstract it was desirable to reduce expenditure, it was extremely difficult to indicate in what direction that reduction should be. It was obvious from the nature of the case that the Budget must always be a matter of compromise. There was a conflict between the claims of the spending Departments and the resistance put forward on behalf of the Treasury. He thought in late years that the claims of the spending Departments had perhaps been listened to too willingly. He believed that hon. Members could do a great deal to lay down the conditions under which sound administration of finance would not only be possible but probable.

He hoped to carry with him the assent of hon. Members on both sides when he put forward three conditions without which it was impossible that the country could be well administered. The first was clear accounts, so established that all the expenditure of the year was included in them, and so clearly laid down that even any non-expert would be capable of realising their contents. The second condition was that there should be a careful revision of the Estimates, so that useless or redundant expenditure might be avoided; and the third was a close examination of the accounts, to avoid all misappropriation and diversion of public funds. He ventured to say that on each of these three points a very considerable improvement could be introduced into the present system. Expenditure might not have grown beyond the capacity of the State to bear; but it certainly had grown beyond the capacity of the accounts as now presented.. No one who had attempted to arrive at a clear and precise idea as to the position of the country could fail to be harassed and irritated by the confusing manner in which the financial results and Estimates were put before the country. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take the matter in hand personally, and endeavour so to recast the form of the accounts in the manner he indicated. The ordinary figures of the Budget expenditure this year were £140,000,000, but that amount did not by any means represent the total estimated expenditure of the country. Several items were either left aside altogether or veiled in small print. That was misleading, and anything that was misleading was thoroughly and radically wrong. If the country had known the full extent of the the naval and military expenditure it would never have grown to its present enormous proportions. Did the House or the country realise what really had been spent. He ventured to assert that not ten Members would be able to state what the expenditure on the Army and Navy for the present year was. He would give any ordinary hon. Member, not a financial expert, three hours in the library and all the Blue-books, and he would guarantee that he would not then have discovered the amount.

The hon. Member who moved the Amendment referred to the Works Bills. He did not think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would contend that the expenditure provided under these loan operations, for they were nothing else, differed essentially from the expenditure contained in the Estimates. He had heard certain specious explanations and precedents of past Chancellors of the Exchequer alluded to, and Mr. Gladstone had been often quoted, but neither Mr. Gladstone nor any other Chancellor of the Exchequer of that time would have put up for one moment with a loan expenditure increasing year by year on naval and military works, and amounting in the current year to something like £7,000,000 or £8,000,000. This was nothing more or less than an extraordinary Budget. The Budget figures which the Chancellor of the Exchequer in a few weeks time would produce to realise his surplus would not be a clear or correct statement of the real financial operations of the year. No one who had attended the debates in Committee of Supply in the House of Commons would contend that they were in any degree debates tending towards economy. It was notorious that the majority of the speakers were far more interested in the particular claim of this or that constituency than in the general aspect of finance, or the maintenance of proper economy. No private Members who had not been properly instructed by a critical examination by means of Question and Answer could possibly be in possession of the necessary information to press the Minister in charge for a proper reduction of the Estimates. What probably occurred was that an ignorant private Member addressed a more or less ignorant Minister on that particular subject. The hon. Member who asked the question probably did not know, and the Minister who replied to it only knew partly, the subject, and he simply repeated what had been supplied to him from under the Gallery. The Prime Minister appointed a Commission on National Finance which took a large amount of evidence and spent a good deal of time in the elucidation of the question, and they presented a Report. That Report suggested that the Estimates should be divided into four or five sections, and that each year one-fifth of the Estimates should be submitted to a Committee on the lines of the Public Accounts, and that the Committee should report to the House in detail after a critical examination. Unfortunately, no results had followed from that Report, and the House had not even had an opportunity of discussing the Estimates in the way suggested. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Government did not see their way to accept those particular recommendations they should at least grant the House an opportunity for their full discussion; and seeing the grave public danger of the present system if these proposals did not find favour, the Government ought at once to put forward some alternative scheme. It was a national scandal that this matter should be left as it was.

The present examination of the Estimates was insufficient, and this fact had been amply proved by what had occurred with regard to the Navy. The Government had recently reduced the Navy by a large number of more or less obsolete and useless vessels. He thought that policy would find cordial approval on all sides of the House, but it could not fail to raise the question of what these vessels were doing on the list for so many years. Possibly after careful examination it might have occurred to some other genius at an earlier stage that those vessels should be struck off the list if sufficient attention and examination had been devoted to the subject. As to the control of accounts, he could not help thinking that Parliamentary control in this respect had gradually become largely formal. It appeared to be the case that Government Departments could waste as much money as they liked if they only put in the proper vouchers, and the actual merit or necessity of the expenditure was a matter of considerably less importance. He could not help arriving at the conclusion that while the control of the accounts at the present time was certainly harassing and irritating, it was not in practice very effective. A disagreeable impression was made last year when it was discovered that about £900,000 had been spent in the course of the year 1901 without any authority having been obtained from the House until fully two years after the money had been expended. He did not question the diligence of the officials concerned, but surely this showed that the system was defective.

But outside the question of method there was another point, viz., that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should not be content with too low a standard of finance. It appeared to him that a great and prosperous country like ours, with an enormous revenue, with great future responsibilities and calls upon the Exchequer, ought not to be allowed to sink in time of peace and fair prosperity into the position of being unable to pay its way and reduce every year by a considerable sum its indebtedness. He ventured to think that in the arrangements made for the past year the Chancellor of the Exchequer had aimed a little too low, and it would have been much better to have been somewhat more ambitious in his scheme of finance and somewhat bolder in his scheme of taxation. He did not agree with the mover of the Amendment in his complaint with regard to taxation, because taxes were, or should be, a necessary consequence of expenditure. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had put on too many taxes, but, on the contrary, he thought he had put on too few. Having recently added an enormous sum both to the Consolidated Debt and the floating debt of the country, it was the strict and bounden duty of those responsible for our finances to reduce the public indebtedness every year by a minimum sum of £6,000,000. He hoped that in the arrangements for the coming year, whatever temptations the Chancellor of the Exchequer might feel towards the popularity of a reduction of taxation, he would only think of a reduction after he had provided for a proper Sinking Fund. The Government had been severely criticised for their extravagance in the past, but he was glad to see what appeared to him signs of financial repentance. He hoped and believed that the Budget of the coming year, whether it would be the last of the present Government or not, would put the finances of the country back upon a higher level. He trusted that the last months of the Government would be employed in regaining the high financial standard of past years so that they might leave upon the financial history of the country a creditable and honourable record.

Sir ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said the criticisms of the last speaker had certainly been of a very mild character, but he would remind the hon. Member that speeches delivered in that key, accompanied by consistent support in the lobby on all occasions, was not the way to obtain economy in the national expenditure. He agreed with the hon. Member in one thing, and that was in regard to his request that the accounts should be presented in an intelligible way. He might mention that upon one occasion it took him not three hours, but more like three days, to find out how much money had been devoted by this country to the Transvaal for the two years after the war, and not including war expenditure. He would defy the most skilful accountant to obtain this information in anything like a reasonable time. He did, however, manage to find £21,000,000 in the two years, and this was admitted in the debate by the Colonial Secretary. This was an instance of the great difficulty they experienced under the present system of accounts of finding out what their expenditure actually was. According to the Blue-book on "Public Receipts and Expenditure," published last year, between 1889 and 1904 the expenditure increased from £74,000,000 to £130,000,000. One very important, though not the chief cause, was the absence of effective control over expenditure by the House of Commons. The allocation of twenty-three days to Supply had had a most prejudicial effect on the influence of the House. The bargains which used to be made were no longer entered into. The terror of Ministers lest Parliament should be shocked at extravagant Estimates and insist on adequate explanations had disappeared, inasmuch as it was only necessary to wait until the expiration of the allotted days and then the whole of the outstanding Estimates would be voted without any discussion whatever. Great changes had taken place since 1880, when he first entered Parliament. At that time Ministers had only two days in the week, the remainder of the time belonging to private Members, who were thus enabled to bring forward in their own time questions of policy, whether important or unimportant. Consequently the time devoted to finance could be applied to the discussion of the Estimates as such, to suggestions of practical economy, and so forth. But the position now was very different. The private Member had been practically squeezed out of existence as a potent force, being looked upon as a poor harmless creature whose interests might be safely ignored, and the indirect effect was very serious. Questions of policy had now to be and were almost exclusively discussed on the Estimates, that being the only opportunity Members had of raising them. In that way the control of the House had been rendered ineffective, because the discussion was no longer directed to the question of economy.

Why had not the Government adopted the recommendation, made at the instance of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, that every year one-fourth of the Estimates should be submitted to the special scrutiny of a Committee upstairs? In his opinion the recommendation did not go nearly far enough. No business in the country could be conducted on the footing of examining the accounts of expenditure submitted by the heads of Departments only once in four years. The whole thing was really absurd. Public scrutiny had gone; and apparently private scrutiny was refused. To examine the accounts once in four years would have some good results; but the Departments would be on their good behaviour when the fourth year came, and be more indifferent during the three years of their "close time." The Government ought to state why they would not grant this simple business facility. The only explanation he had heard was that the heads of Departments could not afford time to come and give the House of Commons information about expenditure. There was no foundation whatever for such an idea. If necessary, an additional permanent official could be appointed, but the House of Commons ought to be given the necessary information. It really seemed as though the Government did not recognise their duty to allow the House of Commons to exercise control. The Government was held in high esteem by their supporters; he did not wish to say that they also thought very highly of themselves, but they were not a substitute for the House of Commons in controlling matters of finance. It was the duty of the Government to enable the House of Commons to control the expenditure of the country, especially in view of the inordinate growth during recent years.

But there was another cause far more operative and far greater in its results, namely, policy. Policy always had controlled and ever would control expenditure. This fact might be illustrated by reference to what he might call the capital account, and the account of revenue and expenditure. The National Debt had increased during the last five or six years by about £160,000,000. That was due solely to the war. He disagreed with the hon. Member for Plymouth that war tended to economy. It did nothing of the kind. War always tended to extravagance, not merely at the time, but for years afterwards. It was so in the cases of the war of 1748, Pitt's Seven Years War, the Napoleonic wars, and the Crimean War, and it was being so in regard to the South African War. The increased annual charge between 1889 and 1904 was £56,000,000, of which £4,000,000 was due to the service of the National Debt and kindred subjects. A portion of that, again, was due to the war. He had always held a very strong opinion about the war, but he did not intend to dwell upon it on the present occasion. When Ministers submitted, and the House of Commons approved, a warlike policy, the blame was shifted from the Ministers to the House of Commons; and when after the dissolution of Parliament the country chose to adopt the policy, wise or foolish, propounded to them, the responsibility was very largely shifted from Parliament to the country. Therefore he did not think there was much room for reproaches in that matter, but he did think it necessary that the House should appreciate, without recrimination or ill-humour of any kind, the real financial significance of such a force as the recent war. The annual service of the Debt had been increased by £4,000,000, in addition to which large sums had been raised by taxation, and other money had been filched from the Sinking Fund to cover expenditure. He did not use the expression offensively, but the apparent outlay was less than the actual expenditure. Then there were items for Somaliland and the China War, amounting to between £8,000,000 and £9,000,000. The heading "Other Charges connected with Capital Liabilities" was concerned, not with the service of the Debt, the permanent debt or the floating debt, but with items under particular Acts ot Parliament which had come into existence practically during the last eight or ten years. In 1889 £104,000 sufficed to meet that expenditure, but in 1904 it had risen to £2,035,000. That showed a change of policy in passing Act after Act by which were imposed upon the country permanent liabilities which ought almost entirely to be met out of revenue. Included in that sum was £1,400,000 in respect of the Barracks Act, the Naval Works Act, the Military Works Act, the Imperial Defence Act, the Uganda Railway, and the Royal Niger Company. Those were the subjects upon which money had been raised amounting to about £1,400,000 a year. He had recently been serving on a Royal Commission in regard to London traffic, and it had struck him that it would be much better to spend this money upon London railways instead of such places as Uganda. Then there was the Royal Niger Co. expenditure.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think that was the policy of your Government, and we are only carrying it out.

Sir ROBERT REID said he was simply dealing with the policy of spending large sums of money outside the country. Upon such matters as the Royal Niger Co., Uganda buildings, fortifications at Halifax, and other parts of the world, he thought this expenditure had gone a great deal too far, and if they desired to keep an eye upon economy they ought to look to those items. With regard to the current expenditure on the Army and Navy he found that in 1904 it amounted to about £58,500,000. As for the Colonies and naval expenditure, he thought the right view was taken by the late Colonial Secretary at the Colonial Conference of 1902 when, in substance, he told the Ministers of the self-governing Colonies that it was not worthy of their dignity that they should leave all the burden of expenditure upon the Army and Navy to this country. He hoped that language would be noticed by the present Colonial Secretary. In regard to our naval expenditure it had grown from £15,000,000 some years ago to £37,000,000. He wished to know if it was true that 120 ships were not only put out of the service but were going to be broken up and sold for old iron. He would also like to know if it was true that some of the ships had been built in comparatively recent times. They would probably know this when the statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty was made. He thought there must be a good deal of wasteful expenditure in regard to the Navy. They were all agreed that a very strong Navy was necessary, but he was by no means clear that the policy the Government had pursued last year of successive large naval programmes had been a wise one. It seemed to him that that policy had a tendency to induce similar expenditure on the part of other nations. With regard to the Army, his hon. friend who moved this Amendment had pointed out that a few years ago the number of troops we kept in the Colonies and other dependencies of the Crown, excluding India, was about 37,000; but now it amounted to 73,000, and we were maintaining no less than 20,000 or 25,000 in South Africa. These 20,000 men in South Africa were one of the results that had flowed from the war. He thought a great deal of the increase on Army expenditure had been due to the increase of garrisons outside this country. The Colonies ought to provide for their own military defence, and some policy should be adopted which would enable this country to withdraw its troops from South Africa, leaving only the same number of troops as there were in that country before the war broke out. He had attempted to show that the large expenditure had occurred partly because of the absence of control of the House, and if the people of this country were prepared to support a quarrelsome and aggressive policy, and adopt the doctrine of pegging out claims for posterity, then they might be certain the expenditure would not go down and, no matter how skilful a Minister might be, the people would still have to bear these intolerable burdens.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he conceived that there was no subject more deserving of the attention of the House and of Ministers than national finance. He was sorry there was no Cabinet Minister present except the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He regretted that the Colonial Secretary was not present, because he was about to challenge some of his statements. The finances of this country for which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was responsible to the House demanded at least some attention from the rest of the Cabinet. There was no subject of greater importance, for the whole destinies of any country depended upon its finances. Our prosperity depended upon sound finance, and if this were true in time of peace it was even more true in time of war. It was the taxpayer and not the soldier or sailor who really waged war. At Austerlitz and Jena and Leipsig it was not Austrian, Prussian or Russian troops that confronted Napoleon—it was the British guineas furnished by the British taxpayer, who paid for more troops and who finally defeated Napoleon. If the finances of a country were bad, and if a nation was crushed by a load of debt, it could not do its work or rise to its destinies either in peace or in war; and if wastefulness and extravagance were perpetually indulged in the nation lost all sense of what was being done, and a country which kept on that road was on the certain way to ruin. Something had been said about the responsibility of this House and the responsibility of His Majesty's Government. What was the use of talking of the responsibility of this House when its control had first of all been destroyed by those most ruthless new Rules, and when the Government for the last ten years, with such a majority as had never been known before for so long a period, had employed that majority with the utmost ruthlessness to serve their own purposes? It was His Majesty's Government that was responsible for this expenditure and not the House of Commons. What his hon. friend opposite had said was perfectly true because the opportunities which existed before the new Rules of bargaining behind the Speaker's Chair for concessions in return for Estimates had now disappeared. He had frequently availed himself of such opportunities with the late Sir William Harcourt. Of course no Member of His Majesty's Government would ever break a promise or falsify a pledge deliberately given. The members of the Cabinet were all charming, plausible, smooth, open gentlemen; delightful in their manners, pleasant in their smiles, but the most unconquerable, hopeless spendthrifts, perfectly incapable of appreciating the value of money. The reckless profligate extravagance of the last few years had no parallel in the history of the world. Their debt was being piled up to a gigantic height, and if they continued for another ten years in the same way their credit would be destroyed and they would be approaching national bankruptcy. If the Government gave honest clear accounts the taxpayer, the simple plain man in the country, would understand what the actual national expenditure was, and would have intervened long ago to prevent its increase.

But instead of this the Government falsified their accounts, and consequently, however anxious an elector or taxpayer might be to do his small part in bringing about economy he never had any real opportunity of knowing what the national expenditure was. That was one reason why so little interest was manifested in the country with regard to financial matters, and really one could hardly blame the taxpayers when His Majesty's Ministers showed so little.

Another reason was this. This country was extremely rich—the richest of all the countries. They were told by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham—and even he was not here—that the country, with all its riches, was bleeding to death. Yet the riches and prosperity of the country were such that as a matter of fact the taxpayer did not greatly feel the exactions of the Exchequer. But if by concealment in the accounts and through the prosperity in the country caused by free trade His Majesty's Government was encouraged to pursue the desperate and unfortunate part that they had been taking during the past ten years, we should soon awake to a national catastrophe beside which all that had hitherto passed would be small indeed.

The system of national accounts varied in different countries. In some places, as in France, they invested the year with a personal character, and referred to that year, which was known as the *Exercice*, every expense which properly or logically belonged to it, whether incurred before or after. That was a rational system, but it sometimes took fifty years to close an account, and it was not a system which facilitated national control. Our system consisted of a cash account or a banker's account in which all receipts were put on one side, and all expenditure on the other. That was the theory of the British accounts. They started without a balance and ended without a balance. They represented concrete receipts and concrete payments within the year. They had nothing to do with any theory of the burden on the taxpayer. Some of the receipts and expenditure might no doubt represent a real burden and some of it an apparent burden, but nevertheless they must put on both sides of the account what they had received and what they had expended. It was perfectly legitimate to explain that such and such items were not really a charge on the taxpayer. In fact an attempt had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton, in what was known as the "Fowler" Return, to do this, but it was so unsuccessful in arriving at what was the real minimum burden on the taxpayer that, in his opinion, it should be rather known as the "Fowler Falsification." If hon. Members would refer to the Sinking Fund Act of 1875, they would see that by statute the accounts should show all receipts and all expenditure. But when each successive Minister wished to prove that his expenditure was less than that of his predecessor, it was in the falsification of these accounts that they had worked their wicked will. They had kept the accounts, not with the view to their being true, but with a motive. If accounts were kept with a motive they could not be true accounts. The motive here was two-fold—first of all to show the expenditure of the country to be as small as possible, and in the second place to make the expenditure from year to year vary as little as possible—whereas if the facts varied the accounts must either vary with them or be false. That was supposed to be the triumph of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He should say that the real triumph would be to present true accounts and to pay his way as he went.

They had had two Chancellors of the Exchequer in his recollection, and no more—he meant Sir Stafford Northcote and Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone's policy in many respects was to his mind to be condemned, but he was one of the greatest financiers that ever lived. He laid down a true principle which he embodied in the Exchequer and Audit Act, 1866—the true charter of true national accounts—that every public receipt of every kind should be paid into the Exchequer, and, consequently, that when it was expended it must be paid out of the Exchequer. The hon. Member did not know whether the House realised to what an enormous extent that true principle had been departed from. Instead of the whole revenue being paid to the Exchequer, a very large amount of it, indeed, never reached the Exchequer at all. By successive Acts of Parliament passed by successive powerful Ministers the Audit Act had been trenched upon, and gnawed away, and instead of every farthing being paid into the Exchequer and paid out of it by Vote of the House, no less than £22,000,000 of receipts in 1903–4, never reached the Exchequer at all and never figured on either side of the account, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer took no account of any part of it when he professed to give a statement of the national finance. In other words, over £22,000,000, every farthing of which was received and every farthing expended, was excluded both from the receipt side and the expenditure side of the national accounts. That was falsification made with a motive, and deceiving to all who saw the accounts. There was the "Payments to Local Taxation Account," out of Customs Excise and Estate Duties, and consisting in the last year of £9,795,073. In addition to that there were Appropriations-in-Aid of over £12,300,000, Appropriations-in-Aid being, as the House knew, receipts by the Department from other sources than the Votes of this House which by Statute the Treasury was empowered to apply to their expenditure. The result was that there was altogether in 1903–4 a sum of no less than £22,687,000 of public receipts which never reached the Exchequer at all, every farthing of which was received and expended, and not a farthing of which was allowed to appear either on the receipt or the expenditure side of the account. He made that statement as the result of a considerable amount of trouble. He had given two months of hard work to trying to place before his countrymen the true position of the finances of the country, so far as he could reach them, restoring their omissions and their proper character. He replaced in the accounts what belonged to them. He thereby endeavoured to, and he thought to some extent did, make it possible to institute the comparison which had been made impossible by the false official system of accounting. He sought to make it possible for the country to understand what our accounts were. He had been flattered by the number of people who read his pamphlet, and he conceived there was some little merit in it, because it had been persistently boycotted by everyone of the Government organs in the Press, from *The Times* downwards.

In regard to Appropriations-in-Aid, undoubtedly there was something to be said for taking the receipts by the Department and applying them in alleviation of expenditure when the amounts were small and insignificant. It was, however, a bad system at the best. It was an unprincipled system not informed by a true theory of accounts, but it would be relatively excusable if the Appropriations-in-Aid were small. But there had been the most enormous growth in these Appropriations-in-Aid. In 1873–4 they amounted to only £394,966, in 1893–4 they had grown to £5,535,931, and in 1903–4 they amounted to the enormous sum of £10,382,407. In 1873–4 the total amount diverted from the Exchequer was £1,200,000, while last year it was £22,200,000, and it was that increase, that enormous falsification of accounts, that had so alarmed him and set him to the humble work he had endeavoured to do for the information of his fellow-countrymen. He conceived, therefore, that one of the greatest of our financial necessities at the present time was the institution of a system by which our accounts should be made true. With the desire of obtaining this he ventured to propose to the Prime Minister the appointment of a small Commission of three or four persons, Treasury officials, and others who should settle a true system and put the accounts on a proper basis. His right hon. friend replied that this was a matter which should be considered by the Public Accounts Committee. Strictly that was so, but really the Public Accounts Committee had been treated in a way which he thought did not conduce to the credit of the Prime Minister or the dignity of the Committee itself. He joined that Committee last year at the request of the Ministry, on the express condition that they were to have a day given to them for the consideration of their Report by the House. That condition was not kept. He would apply to that no harsh term, but hon. Members could find the proper term for themselves. If the Public Accounts Committee were to be treated in that way he could not conceive that it would be so good a body as the small Commission he had proposed. He might be asked why he selected 1903–4 of the preceding years for his work. It was simply because the years 1903–4 was the last year for which any complete figures could be obtained, and having taken that year it followed naturally that he should go back by intervals of ten years for purposes of comparison. It so happened that the comparison took him back first to the year preceding that in which the Government took office and consequently represented the measure of the unbridled extravagance which had certainly been practised by them.

Now, had there been extravagance? It was not denied. They were told that the Ministry boasted they were going to take £6,000,000 off the Navy Estimates by discarding obsolete ships. It was a most proper step? But why was it not taken before? This was a most proper measure in his opinion; but they owed no thanks for it to the First Lord of the Admiralty, but to Sir John Fisher. Why had these ships been allowed to grow old and rotten and kept up so long with their skeleton crews? Was it only in 1905 that they had discovered obsolete ships? They had been there all the time. If the Government had had this luminous idea ten years ago it was not £6,000,000 they would have saved, but £60,000,000. To his mind the fact that they were able to promise these economies on the Navy was the strongest and most complete condemnation of the policy pursued in regard to the Navy for the whole of the past ten years. He had ventured to say, and he repeated, that the remedies for our expenditure and the debt resulting from it were first a jealous frugality, that frugality which caused everyone of the spending Departments to have to fight for every shilling they got. That used to be the rule. The conflicts that went on were terrible over half-crowns and crowns. But now nobody ever came near the Chancellor of the Exchequer who did not go away without a million or two in his pocket. The difficulty now was not to get a necessary shilling but how not to get an unnecessary half-crown. The Gentlemen under the gallery from the Departments knew that he was speaking the truth. The Departments had often found the very greatest difficulty in spending the money forced upon them by the Government. What could be expected when a system of that kind went on?

He supposed the right hon. Gentleman would make the usual argument against all criticism: "The hon. Gentleman is very destructive in his criticisms, but has he anything to propose?" He had a great deal to propose, and when the appropriate moment came he would be ready to publish his proposals. In the meantime he would indicate some general heads under which this economy and frugality might be effected. He took the Navy. He held that by the delay in saving the £6,000,000 a year they had lost a very excellent opportunity of practising frugality. Take the Army. He had been speaking to a gentleman in a high position in the Army administration who said that at least £10,000,000 to £15,000,000 could be saved on the Army expenditure without in the least impairing the efficiency of the Army, any more than the £6,000,000 saving on the Navy impaired the efficiency of the Navy. He did not know whether that was true or not; he had been told it. The idea of an Army in some quarters, however, was a band of music and a few men marching. If there was no band they did not recognise that as an Army. Take the Civil Service. There was a vast deal of economy that might be effected there. He could name instances in which three or four men were employed to do one man's work. Let it not be supposed that he wanted to cut down all the salaries in the Civil Service. He was perfectly convinced that there were salaries that ought to be raised, but yet many which ought to be cut down, where three men were employed to do one man's work, as for instance in rates and taxes, in collection, and the greater part of their time they were idle. The matter of appropriations-in-aid he had already dealt with, but he would remind the House that this House did not in Committee have any control whatever over these appropriations-in-aid. They were appropriated in virtue of the Public Accounts and Charges Act, 1891, by direction of the Treasury, and could not be voted in the House. It was a domestic affair between the Department and the Treasury. Here he would ask attention to the fact that there was one opportunity for the intervention of the House as to appropriations-in-aid. It was on the Appropriation Bill. In Committee on that Bill an Amendment could, he apprehended, be made to and debate might arise on the clause which appropriated the appropriations-in-aid.

Now as to the capital expenditure. The so-called capital expenditure was a mere delusive title intended to disguise. There was no capital, properly so-called, unless the National Debt was capital. Neither was there any national capital account nor could there be capital expenditure. There was no capital account and they could not have one. If there were a capital account it would be necessary to set forth liabilities on the one side of the ledger and on the other the assets; but who was to judge of the value of the assets of the British Empire or of South Africa? It was quite impossible, and therefore this term "capital expenditure" was a deception to disguise the fact that they had made considerable loans—for brick and mortar works mainly—loans that had increased most stupendously and caused a very serious charge every year. Let him tell the House what these were. They were divided between the Army, Navy, and Civil Service. He would show how it worked in the Army and Navy first. The whole cost of the official spending Departments had been and was concealed from this House. The Chancellor of the Exchequer told them that the Army was going to cost in 1903–4 £36,600,000. That was true, but far from the whole truth. For, besides this sum, there was £6,800,000 for appropriations-in-aid, capital issued under the Works Loans Act, £2,950,000, and for work done by the Civil Department, £498,000; so that the total cost of the Army was not the £36,600,000 dealt with by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget statement, but close on £47,000,000. Again, the cost of the Navy was presented as £35,500,000. As a matter of fact, when the corresponding items to those in the Army were added, the Navy cost £40,500,000. The result was to entirely mislead the public and to enable this mis-statement of the finances to be made, which was at the root of all our financial troubles.

The hon. Gentleman who preceded him truly said that one of the great sources of irregularity was the Supplementary Estimates. If the House would pardon him he would like to read what Mr. Gladstone had said on the subject. He would first give the figures. In 1873–4 they amounted to £4,781,419, but that included £3,200,000 for the Alabama Claims, and the Ashanti Vote of Credit £800,000. Deducting these, the Supplementary Estimates in that year were £781,000. In 1893–4, the year before this Government came into office, they were £592,000. But in 1903–4 they were £4,600,000. This vast increase was very largely the fault of the House, for if the House would, as it should, resist and reject every Supplementary Estimate which did not arise from unforeseen circumstances, and could not have been provided for in the ordinary Budget, these Supplementary Estimates would not have grown to such an extent. He pressed on the House the importance of absolutely refusing to any Government Supplementary Estimates which could not be justified as absolutely unavoidable. This was what Mr. Gladstone said in 1863—

> "It had been a matter of regret to him that on several occasions, from very grave and sufficient reasons, Supplementary Estimates had been presented during his term of office, but he was firmly convinced that the whole effectiveness of Parliamentary control depended upon the state of the finances—the balance of income and expenditure—being once a year gathered together and submitted as a whole to Parliament, and in a plan being submitted to Parliament which should substantially, and, in the main‘ govern the whole expenditure and income of the year. But, if from any idea of the supreme control of Parliament, the Government were to be called on every week or every fortnight to bring down Supplementary Estimates, the control of Parliament over the expenditure of the year would be entirely nullified under the semblance of consulting its dignity."

And in 1866, Mr. Gladstone said—

> "With respect to the Supplemental Estimate, for about £200,000, or perhaps something more, His Majesty's late Government are substantially responsible. It is always a matter of very great regret to me when any Supplementary Estimate has to be proposed. I am quite certain there is nothing by which it is so easy to break down everything effected by a system of Parliamentary control as a needless or great extension of Supplementary Estimates."

He would make his last quotation from the next year. Mr. Gladstone, in 1867, said—

> "He was persuaded that if any Party or any Government wished to undermine the constitution of this country, and the control of Parliament over the public finances, they could adopt no more effectual method for the attainment of that object than the presentation of Supplementary Estimates."

He thought he had now made out his case against these Supplementary Estimates which had been so monstrously increasing. He apologised for having taken up so much time, and he would say very little upon Votes on Account. The custom used to be to take these Votes for from £3,000,000 to £5,000,000 sufficient to provide for the expenditure of one or two months, but they were now taken for £20,000,000 or sufficient to provide for five months, and that represented a great loss of control to the House. Improvements had been suggested by which one class of Estimates would be examined each year, but these suggestions had all been set aside by the Government.

All this wasteful and extravagant expenditure had resulted in a most stupendous increase in the Debt, and the worst of it was that this increase had taken place in the most objectionable form, namely, in the Unfunded Debt. This debt was of the same character as the five pound note which a man borrowed from his friend without any security. In round figures the Unfunded Debt on March 31st, 1874, amounted to £4,500,000; in 1884, it was £14,000,000; in 1894, £21,000,000; but in 1904, it had been swollen to the appalling total of £73,600,000; and it was now over £81,000,000. This form of debt had many objections, and one was that it was not equipped with a proper sinking fund, and that it took a great deal of the floating capital in the money market which would otherwise be lent to traders. Therefore when they increased the Unfunded Debt they seriously hampered and impaired trade. They had looked for some diminution of the Debt from the promised contribution of £30,000,000 from the Transvaal. He was going to read certain passages from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, which the Colonial Secretary could either dispute or explain as he thought most appropriate, to show that they were promised £10,000,000 at the begining of 1904, another £10,000,000 at the beginning of 1905, and the last instalment of £10,000,000 at the beginning of 1906, and a most rosy picture was presented of the wonderful position we should then be in. The late Colonial Secretary, speaking on May 6th, 1903, when asking the House to guarantee a loan to the Transvaal, said—

> "Let me say, in the first place, that this loan, which is, as the Committee knows, a guaranteed loan of £35,000,000, for the purpose of the two Colonies, is closely connected with the question of the war contribution. It is true we are not dealing to-day with the raising of the loan of £30,000,000, which will be required in order to pay the British Exchequer the contribution the Colonies are willing to make; but the whole arangement must be treated together; and I might almost say that the support of the Committee to the loan which is now under consideration is indeed conditional upon the contribution of £30,000,000 to which I have referred."

That was very explicit, but the right hon. Gentleman went on to say that—

> "There was a universal acceptance of the principle of the contribution, and a universal willingness to make sacrifices in order to meet it."

He explained that when he first visited the Transvaal he had an idea of a larger contribution, but being a generous-minded statesman—especially with other people's money—he stated that he had reconsidered the matter and he said—

> "I was thrown back upon the arrangement which we have adopted, which was to fix the contribution of the Transvaal at the largest possible sum which it could pay, having regard to its present resources, in the course of the next year or two; and the proposal which I ultimately made with the approval and authority of my colleagues to those with whom I was negotiating was by them—and I think I may say by the British population in the Transvaal generally—accepted unanimously. It was that the Transvaal accepted as their contribution of the British cost of the war a sum of £30,000,000, payable in three annual instalments of £10,000,000 each, which would be provided by a loan, secured solely upon the assets and resources of the Transvaal, and not guaranteed by the British Government; and, in order that the success of the loan might be made assured and to show their own confidence in the prospects of this country in which they are interested, the financial groups associated with the gold industry undertook to underwrite the first £10,000,000 off the loan so as to make its issue an absolute certainty."

The late Colonial Secretary thus declared that the issue of the £10,000,000 and our receipt of it was an absolute certainty, and it was expressly on that declaration that he asked and induced the House to agree to guarantee the other loan of £35,000,000. The present Colonial Secretary indeed had suggested that this was not an absolute certainty, that it was only a contingent certainty, but they were told by the author and negotiator of the whole thing that it was universally and gratefully accepted by the Transvaal, that they were delighted with it, and that it was an absolute certainty. The ex-Colonial Secretary went on to say—

> "What are the advantages of this arrangement? In the first place it is a final arrangement; after three years we shall hear no more on the subject. The bill will have been paid, the claim will have been met, and we shall have no longer any ground whatever for intervention, and all interference in the internal finance of the Transvaal will have been avoided. Next year—that is, in 1903-4—the charge will come upon the Transvaal for its first instalment of the contribution. In the third year the whole loan will be issued, and the total charge for it of £1,200,000 will come to bear. The Legislative Council will, without any difficulty, pass this Ordinance giving legal security to the loan which we will raise, and the first instalment of which we will probably raise at the commencement of 1904."

Thus it was proved that a promise was made by the then Colonial Secretary that if we would agree to guarantee the £35,000,000 we should have £10,000,000 of the £30,000,000 contribution by 1904 and the whole of it by 1906.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington) suggested that more should be quoted from the speech which the hon. Member had read.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I have read a great deal of it; would you like any more?

MR. LYTTELTON: My recollection is that my right hon. friend laid down in that speech that there were three conditions under which this loan was promised. These three conditions have not been read. One was (I speak from memory) that the contribution should be voluntary, the second that it should be made not at the expense of the development of the colony, and the third that the issue should be made at a favourable time.

Mr. Gibson Bowles.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES said all these conditions were provided for according to the speech. The first condition was that it should be voluntary. That condition had already been fulfilled. They had not only agreed to it, but had done so gratefully, cheerfully, and unanimously, and it was a certainty. What was the good of talking of contingent conditions when it was to be a certainty, and when on that representation they had induced the House of Commons to guarantee a loan of £35,000,000? After their confident prediction as to the first £10,000,000 was not fulfilled, they knew that they had incurred a grave responsibility, and he did not wonder that they went looking about the whole of the inhabited world to find something to divert attention from their failure. But he had further evidence. He would now quote the Chancellor of the Exchequer. On April 23rd, 1903, in his Budget statement, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

> "In the present year immediately the Transvaal loan is floated, which I hope will be within a very short time, we are going to repay out of that loan the £4,000,000 which we advanced to the Transvaal, and which will be repaid as a first charge upon this loan."

And then he goes on—

> "On January next"—that is, January, 1904—"we are to receive £10,000,000 more money, not out of the guaranteed loan, but out of the loan which has been underwritten by the Transvaal mineowners. So that within twelve months we shall receive £14,000,000 and the interest upon that £14,000,000 will be £420,000, which will be added to the Sinking Fund as part of the fixed debt charge, and by that time the amount of the fixed debt charge which is available for the extinction of the Debt will be increased by nearly £500,000. In another year"—which is this year, 1905—"we shall get another £10,000,000.

This was the Chancellor of the Exchequer speaking on the authority of the Colonial Minister, who had had the conduct of the proceedings—

> "And in the next year—1906—we shall get a further £10,000,000. So that we are really going to put into the Sinking Fund a sum of about £1,000,000, since the debt which bears this amount of interest will be extinguished in three years. The £1,000,000 which will no longer be required for interest will remain part of the fixed debt charge—that is, will be added to the Sinking Fund, so that by the time this £30,000,000 is paid we shall have a Sinking Fund of close upon £9,000,000 sterling."

He submitted to the House, therefore, that he had established, and that the qualifications suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary had not shaken the establishment of the fact that we were not contingently but absolutely promised by the Colonial Secretary and by the Chancellor of Exchequer this Transvaal Contribution—£10,000,000 at the beginning of 1904, £10,000,000 at the beginning of 1905, and £10,000,000 at the beginning of 1906. The reason he insisted on this was that he was appalled at the Unfunded Debt, and that this sum of £30,000,000 was just what was required to pay off a part of it. If he had any influence with the Government, and could suppose that they took any other interest in his proceedings than that which centred at King's Lynn, he would beg them either themselves to make directly, or again to send out the Member for West Birmingham for the purpose of making, some arrangement for the retarded payment of this £30.000,000. Hallam tells us that St. Louis for the salvation of his soul and those of his ancestors pardoned the Christians one-third of all the debts they owed to the Jews. He was afraid that example was going to be followed by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, who for the salvation of his own soul and that of his ancestor would practically pardon the Jews of the Transvaal the debts they owed to the Christians of England.

He would not dwell on other national liabilities such as that for guaranteed loans, which was stupendous, the Savings Bank liability, the whole of which was payable at call, or the local debt of this country. All these liabilities added together made a total that was perfectly appalling. The remedies were frugality and retrenchment. Let not the smallest economy be despised, let every item be scrutinised closely. It was in this way they got those small economies, which mounted up to so much in the end. In order to get back to sound financial principles and make some provision for our debt, two things at least were required—a Prime Minister who was convinced of the necessity of economy, and a Chancellor of the Exchequer who had some natural ability for finance, some intelligence, some aptitude, and some knowledge of finance. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said he could not accept the hon. Member for Croydon as a Chancellor of the Exchequer merely because he had passed two or three months under the tuition of the permanent officials of the Treasury. That was true of every Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether he had risen to the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer by his own merit, or whether he had been jobbed into that position by a family pact or a political intrigue. He took a great financial interest in the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and if the right hon. Gentleman could do something to reduce the burden of debt, make an adequate provision for the sinking fund of the Funded Debt, which could only be done by the allocation to that purpose of a specific tax, and if he could do something to reduce that most mischievous thing the Unfunded Debt, and would claim and obtain for that purpose the fulfilment of the promise made by the Transvaal that we should have this £30,000,000—if the right hon. Gentleman would do that, and attempt to put our financial house in a little better order, he would aid the right hon. Gentleman in such a course to the utmost of his power. The financial history of this Government had been disastrous. However desirous he might be of supporting the Government—and desirous of it he was, for he was a Tory, and would always remain a Tory; yes, and a much better Tory than some of those who had been imported from Birmingham—there were matters on which he must follow out the political convictions which he had always avowed. One of these was Finance, the present position of which was most dangerous. He felt the danger most seriously, he could not therefore resist this Amendment, and should feel it to be his bounden duty to give his vote in support of it.

Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer represented a Government which was incompetent, and a system of finance which was deplorable, and therefore every opportunity ought to be taken to protest against it. One fundamental principle which must not be lost sight of was that a Conservative Government from the nature of things must be an expensive Government, as they had particular interests to conserve and propitiate, and it had been the fate of this nation that whenever a Conservative Government was in power expenditure had gone up by leaps and bounds. Lately the country had suffered from a Liberal Unionist amalgamation which had put all Conservative Administrations altogether in the shade so far as expenditure was concerned. In no period of history had there been more reckless expenditure or callous disregard of the grievous burdens they had placed upon the people. That was the price we had to pay for this Administration. If we looked at our national expenditure for the year 1894–5, we found that the amount for Consolidated Fund and Supply purposes was £94,000,000. For the current year that amount had increased to £143,000,000, and the local taxation account had increased during the same period from £7,000,000 to £9,600,000, whilst the naval and military works which at that date stood at £810,000 for the year, were now £10,000,000. There had been an increase of £60,500,000 altogether apart from appropriations-in-aid with which he would not at the present deal for fear of complicating his argument. The aggregate of the increases that had taken place came to a sum that was appalling. The aggregate increase over the expenditure of 1895 for the last ten years amounted to £248,000,000. He quite admitted that there must be a gradual increase of expenditure as every fair-minded man who studied finance must admit, but if we made due allowances for increase of expenditure during those ten years, and made allowance for the expenditure on the war, we had to face an increase amounting to the appalling total of £400,000,000.

Were we getting value for the money that was being spent in the ordinary expenditure of the nation? The expenditure on the Army in ten years had increased by £12,000,000, altogether apart from military works, yet it was an admitted fact that our Army now was less efficient than in 1904. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War himself admitted that the expenditure on the Army was excessive, and was about to make reductions. The House welcomed the reduction of expenditure in the Army, and would welcome it in the Navy as well. He would like to compare our national expenditure with that of a foreign country. The population of Germany was 58,000,000, against our 42,000,000, yet the German estimate of expenditure for the current year was only £97,250,000, against our £143,000,000. The real revenue of Germany was unable to meet that expenditure. Here was a lesson he would commend to the Tariff Reformers. The food taxes were so oppressive that they could not raise any further revenue, and they had to borrow to meet a part—£2,500,000—of the ordinary expenditure. The Chancellor of the Exchequer last year seemed to have adopted the German method, seeing that he made up the deficit of £5,500,000 partly out of borrowed money, partly out of the unclaimed dividend account, and £1,500,000 had still to be met. It was no wonder that the Debt was increasing under the present system of finance as administered by the present Government. Our Sinking Fund was a sham, and our floating debt a danger. In 1894 Sir William Harcourt, in his Budget speech, said—

> "I have always been desirous that the amount of the Unfunded Debt, so far as it may be considered floating debt, in the hands of the public should be reduced."

The floating debt at that time was £11,500,000, and Sir William Harcourt proposed to reduce it by £750,000. Now, as the hon. Member for King's Lynn had pointed out, the total Unfunded Debt in round figures amounted to £21,000,000. The floating debt now stood at £82,000,000, and as £4,000,000 of that had to be paid off before the end of the financial year, it left the Unfunded Debt at £78,000,000. The Sinking Fund in 1894–1895 reduced the indebtedness, which was then £667,000,000, by £6,500,000, but last year under the system of finance as administered by the present Government the Debt was reduced on the one hand by £5,149,000, and was added to on the other by £4,298,000, leaving the total net reduction at £850,000. The hon. Member for King's Lynn also referred to the question of the floating debt, and the desirability of its being reduced. He would make a suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman's predecessor, the Member for Croydon, in 1903 estimated how the then floating debt was to be reduced, but there were one or two figures the House ought to bear in mind in considering this question. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon estimated in 1903 that there would be a sum of £40,000,000, which would go to reduce the Unfunded Debt, made up of £30,000,000 from the Transvaal, £4,000,000 due on account of expenditure made by this country on behalf of the Transvaal, and £6,000,000 from the Chinese indemnity—he had only got £3,000,000 out of that £40,000,000. The first instalment of £10,000,000 of the Transvaal loan was guaranteed by fifteen mineowners. Their number was now reduced to thirteen. If others were removed to another sphere, would those who remained be responsible for the £10,000,000? He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer should tell the House why this first instalment was not being issued. One way in which the right hon. Gentleman could get another £30,000,000, which could be appropriated to the extinction of the Unfunded Debt, was from the terminable annuities. The terminable annuities falling in this year amounting to £3,000,000 or £4,000,000. If the right hon. Gentleman renewed those he could write off a block of Consols to the amount of £30,000,000, which would not only reduce the Debt by that amount, but would have a splendid effect on the money market. There had lately been wholesale reduction of expenditure. That was well and good, but he hoped the reductions were real, and that the Government had not simply put off expenditure for which their successors would have to provide. What was wanted to-day was a return to the spirit of Gladstonian finance. Mr. Gladstone lived in times of great difficulty, when, as he himself said, it was harder to save a shilling than to spend a million, but he faced the difficulty boldly. The present financial position demanded the greatest care, and he trusted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would look the situation boldly in the face, that he would answer the questions which had been put with reference to the Transvaal Loan, and that with the coming year the Sinking Fund would be put on a firm and sound basis.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am certain that any one who has listened in this House as often as I have done to the hon. Member for Perthshire knows the interest that he has always taken in our financial discussions and the constant pressure that he has attempted to exert on the Ministry of the day to secure further economy. I cannot therefore be surprised, and I do not in the least complain, that he should have seized this opportunity of putting down the Amendment which he has moved to-day and initiating a discussion upon it. But the fact that the discussion is raised at this time has its inconveniences, and, as the House can see, necessarily limits the scope of my reply. The debate has travelled very far afield, far, I think, beyond the terms of the hon. Gentleman's Amendment, and certainly far beyond his opening speech. It has engaged hon. Members in a discussion as to the policy of the Admiralty in regard to ships which are being put out of commission, as to the future policy of the War Office, as to what would be the right course for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to pursue in presenting this next Budget, and as to other matters of this kind in regard to which, within a few weeks at the outside, we must be in possession of full information, but in regard equally to which it is impossible for me, speaking here to-day, to anticipate the information which will be laid before the House. Quite obviously it is not for me on the occasion of a debate of this kind to justify the alterations which the Board of Admiralty have made upon their responsibility. I neither accept nor deny the estimates given by various gentlemen as to the financial results of those proposals. Neither can I anticipate to-day the Estimates of military expenditure which will be laid in a short time by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War. These subjects must be discussed, and no doubt will be discussed, by the House when it is in full possession of the facts. The most I can do to-day is to refer to those more general subjects with which various hon. Gentlemen have dealt, and with some of the criticisms of what has occurred in the past, without indicating in any manner what action we may be proposing to take in the near future in regard to them.

The hon. Gentleman and others who have taken part in the debate complain of an excessive growth of expenditure and of an insufficient care on the part of the Government to maintain the ends of economy and preserve that close scrutiny and inquiry into all our expenditure which is necessary to see that none of it should be wasted. I confess that in one respect this debate has been an unusual and pleasant experience. Since I have held my present office I have been accustomed to severe criticisms of what are supposed to be my own peculiar views, shared by none of my predecessors. The hon. Gentleman who opened this discussion, however, said that his Amendment was meant to impugn the whole financial policy of the Government during the past ten years. It is therefore not so much my own misdeeds, if misdeeds they are, that I am called upon to defend, as the financial purity or wisdom of my right hon. friends the Members for West Bristol and Croydon. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition has invented a theory which he has repeated on several occasions in the country and once or twice in this House, that the present Chancellor of the Exchequer has secret motives, ulterior motives of his own—which the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman alone enables him to pierce—for stimulating expenditure, for maintaining expenditure at the highest figure possible, in order that he may not be called upon to reduce taxation, or take off any of our present burdens, and, indeed, that he may find an excuse for imposing fresh ones.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): What I said was that the high rate of expenditure is, undoubtedly, if one may use a pedantic word, ancillary to the adoption of the policy which it is understood the right hon. Gentleman favours in fiscal matters.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If that is all that the right hon. Gentleman meant to be understood——

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is what I said.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not challenge it. Undoubtedly the level at which the existing taxes stand, the smallness of any reserve which is open to us if we should be faced by another great emergency, the inability to extend the existing taxes to any large extent to meet such an emergency, is in itself a grave reason for considering carefully our fiscal position, and for seeking, whatever our views on the fiscal question, some other means by which a portion of our revenue may be raised and by which the level of the present taxes may be reduced. But I think that if the right hon. Gentleman looks back on what he said he will see that he used language which not merely led inevitably to the inference that such an argument was ancillary to the argument of tariff reformers, but which would lead his hearers to infer that I was deliberately keeping up expenditure in order to produce such a result. Well, I accept, of course, the right hon. Gentleman's disclaimer. I am glad to hear that he gives me a clean bill in that respect, and that he, at any rate, would not suggest that I have not, according to my means and according to what appear to me to be the true interests of the country, done my best to observe, and cause others to observe, economy in the administration of the finances of the country.

Now, Sir, the growth within recent years has been very large. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries was perfectly correct when he said that a large portion of that growth was directly due to the great war which we waged in South Africa, and that any great war must always leave us with largely increased expenditure. ["No, no!"] He was perfectly correct when he said that that is not, as the hon. Member for Plymouth appears to think, an exceptional result following on the late war, but that it has been the actual result following upon all previous great wars. If the hon. Member for Plymouth would study the speeches of Mr. Gladstone after the Crimean War as carefully as the hon. and learned Gentleman has done he would see that among the evils of the war, in Mr. Gladstone's opinion, not the least was that it fatally led to expansion of expenditure.

Mr. GUEST: Not on this scale.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That is not a contradiction of what I am saying. I said that the hon. and learned Gentleman was perfectly right in saying that a very considerable increase in our expenditure was due directly to the war. Further, it is no doubt due indirectly to the war that the experience of that war, still fresh in the minds of some of us, pointed out defects in our organisation for the defence of Imperial interests which, at the time, it was made a ground of complaint that the Government had not already provided for, and which we should indeed have been lacking in our duty if we had not sought to provide for after that experience. But do not let it be supposed that the whole of this growth is by any means due to the war or to military or naval preparations intended to place us in a proper position of defence in case of a future war. Our expenditure grows, and grows much faster than I like, by a normal, and what I might almost call an automatic process. Take a single subject as an illustration, the growth of our educational expenditure. That expenditure grows year by year, apart from new demands which the House of Commons makes, apart from new duties imposed, by very large sums, by the purely automatic growth which occurs in the number of children attending the schools. Take one other illustration—the growth of our Post Office expenditure. The Post Office expenditure has risen largely in the course of the last ten years, partly because we are doing a bigger business and have a larger turnover, partly because we have spent considerable sums of money either in giving increased facilities to the public or, to an even larger extent, in giving increased advantages to the *employés* of the State.

Now, I do not think that much is gained by general complaint as to the growth of expenditure. That does not help you to reduce expenditure. We are all agreed, and no one in my position can fail to agree, that this high expenditure is undesirable in itself, that any reduction which can be safely made it is highly desirable to make, and that all new demands should be closely scrutinised not merely with regard to the desirability or otherwise of the actual expenditure proposed, but with regard to the general state of our financial resources and the compatibility of our financial position with the fresh demands made upon it. Again, I venture to say that the House in this matter is itself largely responsible; and if expenditure is not greater now even than the huge figure it has attained, that is not due to any check or control exercised by the House of Commons, but is due to the resistance of my colleagues, my predecessors, and myself to incessant and almost daily demands which the House of Commons makes upon us. The House of Commons in these matters is apt to separate itself as it were into two entirely different personages, the one taking no responsibility for the deeds of the other. At one moment we are urged to re-arm the artillery, then to build more ships, to pay postmen higher wages, to give a penny postage for the whole world, to light the coasts and harbours of our land free, to give larger grants to local authorities for education, and for half-a-dozen, I might almost say half-a-hundred, other purposes, such as the increase of Government interference in trade and industry, the appointment of new inspectors, the sending of a fresh army of officials travelling throughout the country. If this should be thought not to be a sufficient enumeration of what is expected of the Government in its capacity of a body of reformers, let me recall the demand made for the establishment of State works to provide labour for the unemployed which is favoured by the hon. Member opposite, who represents one of the Divisions of Leeds, and the demands with which I am favoured very nearly every day, certainly every week, and are familiar to every member of the Government for the establishment of harbours of refuge or fishing harbours in the constituencies of hon. Gentlemen in England, Scotland, and Ireland. I could go on enumerating the demands; they are of daily, almost hourly, recurrence. My right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War told me this morning that he had spent two days on this bench recently listening to a discussion on the Army, in which each and every economist urged an increase in expenditure. Then comes round the time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer is taken to task, when the House of Commons, assuming a serious aspect, shakes its finger bravely at him, and tells him he is an extravagant man, and that if he does not check expenditure still further he will bring the country to ruin. Now, cannot hon. Members themselves bring the two sides of their personalities together when they come to discuss these matters in the House; and when they desire a reduction of expenditure, a decrease in the national burden, have I not a right to ask that they should exercise as much self-restraint as is demanded in not pressing on the Government fresh expenditure or other objects which the Government are anxious to avoid?

The hon. Gentleman who moved this Amendment recognised the difficulty of sudden reduction in expenditure, and made an observation which is full of truth, but which, I think, sometimes escapes the attention of hon. Members on that side of the House. "Sudden reductions," he said, "do not always lead to true economy." The hon. Member who spoke last gave an illustration of how reductions might fail to produce economy by boasting that, whenever his own Party were in office, they managed to reduce expenditure on the Army and Navy, and that whenever gentlemen of our Party came into office that expenditure went up. A portion at least of the increased expenditure under us has been due to the fact that their reductions were not economies and were not justified at the time they were made. We have had to make good their negligence and fill up the gaps which they left. [Cries of "No, no," and "Artillery."] Yes, we recognise our obligation in regard to artillery; we are proceeding with the rearmament of the artillery in a time and with a rapidity no Government in this country has ever attempted before—I am almost inclined to say no great Power has ever achieved. But I only say this in passing, that we recognise the obligation, and that it will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. GUEST: Who is going to pay?

Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The taxpayers of this country, but what is the good of pressing that expenditure should be reduced when you admit the necessity for the expenditure? What is the use of blaming us because an increase is involved?

Mr. GUEST explained that his remark had reference to the contrast the right hon. Gentleman was making between reductions and expenditure.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I remember how this time last year the hon. Gentleman held different views. Those among whom he now sits were speculating in the same way on an early dissolution, and saying that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to make a dissolution Budget in the same way as has been suggested to-night. I am not going to disclose Budget secrets; but, at any rate, whatever hon. Gentlemen may think, I have sufficient regard for the high responsibilities of my great office not to allow myself to be deflected from the path of wise and sound finance from any desire to snatch a political or Party gain. I think I may at least claim that in the only Budget for which I have been responsible I did not shirk the burden that devolved upon me; I did my best to fairly meet, and not without courage, a very difficult position.

Now I turn from the general question of the growth of expenditure to some of the other criticisms and questions which have been addressed to me. A great deal has been said as to the form of our accounts, and my hon. friend the Member for Exeter in particular put forward a request that accounts should be recast and presented in a clear form so that every hon. Member and every intelligent citizen could easily see what our exact financial position is. Well, I shall be heartily glad to consider any criticism he may offer on the best form of accounts, and as far as in me lies to facilitate a clear understanding of the financial position by the House and the country. But I do not think hon. Members are at all agreed as to the data that would give us a true account of our financial position. So far as I know, if I may be permitted to say so, the best financial Return that is laid before the

House is that which is known by the name of its author, the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton—the "Fowler" Return. That, I think, gives a better statement than any of the other Returns issued. But I do not know how far that meets the views of my hon. friend. It is all-important in this matter to arrive at a decision as to what the accounts ought to show in order that a correct view of the position should be given. The hon. Member for King's Lynn has a theory of his own. He has intervened in the debate to-night and has undertaken to give His Majesty's Government what he is pleased to call his usual support, but perhaps he will allow me to say his claim is excessive. It appears that in future when he speaks he requires the presence in the House of all the members of the Cabinet, together with other Members to whom he may refer.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I never made any such statement. The right hon. Gentleman is grossly misrepresenting me.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am in the recollection of many Members who were present. I maintain the statement I have made; his attacks upon my colleagues were meaningless unless they had the meaning I have ascribed to them. The hon. Member has alluded to a pamphlet he published during the recess, from which, I think, Members have culled a good deal of the information we have had to-day. Now in the accounts put forward by the hon. Member—to take one figure alone—the expenditure 1893–94 is made out to be £177,000,000, but according to the "Fowler" Return the correct figure should be £130,500,000, or, if local taxation is included, £140,000,000.

*Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: The "Fowler" Return does not deal with expenditure, but with a theory of the burden on the subject.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is the burden on the subject that has been the burden of this debate, which is the object of this debate, and is, after all, what the subject wants to know. The hon. Member for Exeter said the accounts required clearness, and he complained of the method by which capital expenditure was dealt with under the Naval and Military Loans Works Act. We have often debated the policy of these measures, and I think I have made my views on the subject pretty well known. The meeting of exceptional capital expenditure by means of short loans with special sinking funds attached was a policy initiated by the late Government for excellent reasons when Sir William Harcourt was Chancellor of the Exchequer. There will and must be occasions when need arises for a very large sum for capital expenditure for works of permanent advantage to the country, and which cannot fairly be charged on the annual revenue. If you attempted to charge this expenditure on the annual revenue you would so disturb the taxation and financial system that you would have a great reaction against the policy you pursue. One of two things must happen—either the works must be included in annual expenditure or you must have recourse to the expedient initiated by hon. Gentlemen opposite when in power, and developed by us. I recognise that they may say that we have given too large an extension to the principle they have set up. That is the criticism of the more careful among them. I myself have always held that such loans should not be a permanent part of our annual financial system, that they were only justified in cases where very large capital expenditure was a necessity, and that we should seek, as far as possible, and apart from these exceptional occasions, to defray our expenditure from year to year as we went along out of the revenue. I am anxious that the era opened by the first Naval Works Bill should be brought to a close as early as possible, and that so far as possible we should confine any expenditure under this system to the works already included under those Bills by Parliament, and should not admit new subjects of expenditure.

The hon. Member for Exeter claimed also as a point on which we should agree a careful revision of the details of all Votes in order to see that there was no extravagance, no waste. I entirely agree with him. It is the primary duty of each Department in regard to its own expenditure; and any

Department which fails to carry out that review year by year fails in its duty to the House and to the country. It is secondarily the duty of the Treasury, and it is the main method of that financial control which the Treasury exercises over all the ordinary expenditure of the country. But I do not believe, as my hon. friend does, that the House will undertake the detailed work necessary for that kind of examination, or that it can effectively discharge the duties of the office primarily by means of a Committee upstairs. We have heard a great deal about the new Naval Memorandum expounding the policy of the Navy. Some hon. Members have attempted to argue that because it was right in the opinion of the Admiralty to make this change now, it must have been right to make it at any indefinite period in the past. They complain that surrounding circumstances did not change in a given way on a given day, but surrounding circumstances have shown that a great change of policy was possible. Such a change in the adaptation of means to an end could not possibly be enforced by a Committee like the Public Accounts Committee; and if the House refers the subject to any Committee like that, then the House, without gaining a more efficient financial control, will either take from Ministers a large share of their responsibility, which will be spread instead over the whole body of the House, or they will deprive themselves of those opportunities of influencing policy which the House now possesses in discussing the Estimates in Committee.

There is one other observation of my hon. friend with which I have considerable sympathy. He alluded to what I may describe as the posthumous control of expenditure, the control exercised by the Controller and Auditor-General and the Public Accounts Committee on all expenditure already incurred. He suggested that the activities of the Public Accounts Committee and of the Controller and Auditor-General were too much directed to an observance of red tape and too little to the real facts of the financial situation. I think that control was established to prevent something which now practically never occurs. It was established in order to prevent fraud or improper use of money voted by the House. The elaborate system of auditing the accounts was adopted for that purpose, and now that there are no longer any great abuses the objections of the critics are naturally drawn to minute points. It is within the power of the Public Accounts Committee—and it has been used within recent years in my own experience when I sat on it as Financial Secretary—to examine into that class of questions which my hon. friend desires to see inquired into; and I agree with him that so employed the Public Accounts Committee is doing some of its most useful work. The suggestion has been made that we should have an opportunity of debating the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee. To my mind that is a most reasonable proposal, a most sensible and businesslike proposal. It is almost due to the members who sit for so many days and give up a great deal of time, and I believe that it will be useful to the House and not unprofitable to Ministers. I am certain that if the House were generally pleased to allot one of the days given to Supply to use in this way the Prime Minister would be perfectly ready to accede to the wishes of hon. Members.

I have a few further observations to make on the general state of our accounts. The hon. Members for King's Lynn and Plymouth took great exception to the system of Appropriations-in-Aid. That is no novel system. It is a system of old standing, adopted and continued after full inquiry and careful examination. Unless the House has some such system as that it will falsify its own maxim. Suppose a Government Department sells waste stores and substitutes stores of a better quality. What is the real cost to the country? It is the difference between the two; and if you give, not the difference between the two, but the whole cost of the new stores, you do not bring the truth home; you disguise it. The most serious point, however, is the statement of those two hon. Members as to our debt and the existing provision for liquidating it. The hon. Member for Plymouth said that there were two kinds of debt, Funded and Unfunded, and that for the Unfunded Debt there was no sinking fund. He is under a complete misapprehension. For the Unfunded Debt, except that part of it which is raised for military and naval works and similar purposes, the ordinary sinking funds are as much available as for the Funded Debt.

MR. GUEST: Do I understand that the sinking fund extinguishes the Unfunded Debt?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is applied at the discretion of the authorities of the day to the Funded or Unfunded Debt. The one portion of the Unfunded Debt to which the sinking funds are not available is sums raised for capital purposes, and all those sums are provided for with their own special sinking fund. I say nothing as to the sufficiency or otherwise of the provision made for the reduction of debt, but I should like the House to know what the provision is, and to compare it with 1894, the year before the Unionist Party came into office. On March 31st, 1894, the deadweight debt stood at £664,795,000 and the borrowing for capital purposes was £2,496,000, making our capital liabilities £667,291,000. The total amount devoted to paying off the deadweight debt and new debt was £6,687,000, which represented a percentage of 1·002 of our total liabilities. On March 31st last year the deadweight debt was £762,630,000, and there was borrowed for capital purposes £31,868,000, making the total debt £794,498,000. The total amount devoted to paying off the two kinds of debt during the present year was £8,326,000. That represents a percentage of 1·047 of the total present capital liabilities, or a fractional increase over the percentage of sinking fund and liabilities ten years ago.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): Are the £8,000,000 a reduction of debt after making allowance for the new creation of debt for military and naval works?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I hope the hon. Member will allow me to pursue my argument. He asks me a question, the answer to which he knows perfectly well. If the hon. Gentleman wants an answer, that is not in excess of the new capital raised for works this year, any more than the figure which I gave for the earlier year was in excess of the new capital raised. The figures for the two years were on the same basis, and the proportion of sinking fund to our liabilities is fractionally higher now than it was at that time.

There is one further observation I must make in regard to this matter. The hon. Member for King's Lynn seems to think that no portion of the terminable annuities is really available for the sinking fund. That is a complete misapprehension. All that part of the terminable annuities which is replacement of capital is an actual part of the sinking fund. One other observation on the account given of the financial position by the hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn. The hon. Gentleman sums up the country's liabilities, national and local. He includes in the national liabilities the whole of the local loans, and when he talks of the local liabilities he includes them again. Thus they appear twice. There are some corrections which I hope the hon. Gentleman will introduce into the next edition of his pamphlet, and I hope that in his attempts at high finance he will not forget simple arithmetic. There is one other question to which I must allude, if only that I may not seem discourteous to the hon. Gentleman who immediately preceded me. He thought the House was entitled to a full explanation from me or from the Government as to their intentions and policy with regard to the Transvaal war contribution. The House is entitled to full information at the earliest possible moment at which we can give it. I told the House the other day, and the Colonial Secretary repeated it, that we are not in a position to make any statement on this subject at the present time. We shall be only too happy, when we are able, to take the House into our confidence and give them all the information they can desire or have a right to expect.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): Can we have it at an early date?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I hope we may have it before very long, but I cannot make any pledge, for I know that if I did so the hon. Gentleman would put Questions down twice a week with the object of finding out when the early day is to be. I think I have covered as far as is necessary, or possible, in the present circumstances the scope of this discussion. My answer on many points is necessarily incomplete, because we are really invited to a discussion of the Army and Navy Estimates, which are not yet in the hands of Members, the Transvaal war contribution, upon which the Government is not yet in a position to make any further statement, and of the proposals of the Budget, which I shall have to make in a month or six weeks time, but which I must decline to anticipate, even to gratify the curiosity of hon. Gentlemen of this House. It must be, as long as I hold my present position, my earnest endeavour to see that not more money is taken from the taxpayer's pocket than is really required for the service of the nation. It has been my duty many times already to resist expenditure, desirable in itself, which I thought the taxpayer could not afford or ought not to afford at the time. I do not doubt that it will be my duty to do so in the future. I hope when I come to resist unreasonable and exorbitant demands I shall have the support of all those advocates of economy who have been so lavish of their criticism to-day.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I did not intend to take any part in this discussion, but there is one line of defence which the right hon. Gentleman has adopted which induces me to say a few words to the House. He said that the main part of the blame rests not with the Government or their policy, but with the House of Commons. When the right hon. Gentleman says he cannot give a complete answer or make a complete statement on behalf of the Government, because the Estimates of the coming year are not yet in the hands of Members, that is not the question before the House at all. The question before the House is the general tendency and current of the expenditure of the Government for the last ten or fifteen years; and however much by a death-bed repentance they may redeem themselves, as they think, in the Budget that is to come, that does not in the least affect our judgment of the course they have pursued in the past. The right hon. Gentleman, as I have said, blames the House of Commons. I agree with him to a certain point. When he denounces the habit of Members of urging—rightly or wrongly—additional expenditure upon the Government, of attacking the Government for refusing demands that are made upon them—sometimes, no doubt, demands to which individual Members engage themselves among their constituencies—in all that I am entirely in accord with the right hon. Gentleman. But that question does not affect the case before the House of Commons, because we assume that this Government of all the virtues is strong enough to refuse those demands that are made upon them. The Government introduces Estimates, and it is by the Estimates and the side matters of expenditure affiliated to the Estimates that we judge the expenditure and policy of the Government. It is part of their duty to give the tone in this matter to the House of Commons, and if there is recklessness in the country or in the House—a recklessness as to expenditure, an indifference to expenditure, a desire to see greater expenditure—an idea that great expenditure is good for the country—and I am afraid to some extent there is—no one has contributed to the creation of that feeling so much as the right hon. Gentlemen who sit on the bench opposite. The right hon. Gentleman has been objecting to the tone which he has noticed. I am afraid he condemns the result of his own teaching. It does not lie in his mouth to say it is the fault of the House of Commons.

We have had a great deal said in this most instructive debate. I regret that most Members of the House did not hear the speeches of my hon. friends the mover and seconder, which I thought admirable, of the hon. Member for Exeter, whose authority we all recognise, and, of course, the masterly speech of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, who has made this subject his own. A great deal has been said about methods of improving the control over expenditure by the House of Commons. I think there is much need for improvement. But I have never yet quite seen my way to the manner of giving it. I have seen and heard a good many things proposed which I am afraid when they came to work, instead of having a beneficial would have a prejudicial effect on the expenditure of public departments. I think one thing has conduced to lowering the power of the House of Commons in this respect, and that is the new arrangement with regard to Votes in Supply. Hon. Members have pointed out that after a certain day the guillotine falls and then the whole thing goes by the board. But there is a great deal more than that; because when a day is set aside for a discussion of the Votes of a certain Department the Minister in charge of that Department knows that, if he can only harden his heart and set his teeth and pass through the ordeal of the discussion, then from the moment twelve o'clock strikes he is a free man. able to snap his fingers at the House of Commons, and perfectly indifferent to what their opinion may be; his Vote will not come on till next year; and, therefore, to that extent the influence and power of the House of Commons has been lowered. In the old days, it is true, there was a great deal of irregular discussion, there was a great deal of uncertainty as to the time when the discussion would come on; the Minister always was liable to have his Vote deferred and deferred, postponed and postponed, and always had the fear hanging over him that sooner or later he would have to bear the brunt of discussion, and probably meet divisions and the criticism of Members. But, after all, the one thing I wish to dwell upon, having now been drawn to enter upon the matter, is that, however important those matters that I have just been speaking of may be, and all the questions of forms of account and of financial machinery—which are, indeed, worthy of all attention from the House—the thing which governs the whole matter is the policy of the Government. No amount of good accounting, of good control by the House of Commons, will do any good to stop this dreadful current of expenditure. Nothing less than a change of the policy which creates that expenditure will suffice.

Let me refer just before I sit down to one observation which the right hon. Gentleman made. He imputed to me that I had been saying somewhere in the country that he was perhaps not very sincere in his opposition to expenditure, because expenditure rather played up to certain fiscal doctrines to which he is supposed to be attached. I do not know that I have gone the length of attributing to him, and certainly never intended to attribute to him, anything in the nature of insincerity; but I do think that, having the opinions he holds on that subject, he is not so likely to look at high expenditure with the same horror as others of us look upon it. If you trace the history of protection, you will find that high tariffs everywhere have had their origin in high expenditure. In Germany, France, and the United States, indisputably, high tariffs were not adopted at all because of a love for high tariffs, but because expenditure being so high these countries were driven to protective taxes. It was in that sense that I said we could hardly expect that strong objection to a high rate of expenditure in a devotee of that system that you would expect in those who take, as I think, a more orthodox view of our fiscal position. I merely rose to express my opinion upon two or three points; but I venture to reiterate, before I sit down, what I think is the hinge upon which everything turns—namely, that our high expenditure is not the fault of the House of Commons or its rules, or its financial methods, but is the fruit of the policy of His Majesty's Government, and it is by changing that policy, and by such means alone, that that expenditure can be reduced.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said he should vote for the Amendment, not because he regarded the expenditure as excessive, but because it was misdirected. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had named certain matters in connection with which he was continually being pressed to incur expenditure, but which pressure, as the guardian of the national purse, he had resisted. One of those matters was education. The Government were starving education, and then clamouring for protection against the product of better education abroad. Another matter in regard to which the right hon. Gentleman had resisted expenditure was harbours of refuge, which were intended to give seamen and fishermen opportunities of saving life in time of distress. Then there was unemployment. The existence of thousands of men out of work had created a demand for certain expenditure, but the Chancellor of the

Exchequer gloried in the fact that he had resisted that demand. The right hon. Gentleman apparently boasted also of the fact that the Government did not pay its workers the same standard rate of wages as was paid by private firms for the same kind of work. On all these subjects the Government was proud of its economy. But therein lay the charge against the Government. Educational expenditure during the last ten or eleven years had increased by £5,500,000, while in the same period military expenditure had gone up by over £50,000,000. Personally, he did not complain of the growing expenditure, but he did complain of money being wasted on war and military experiments whilst causes which would protect life, make life better worth living, and develop better citizens, were starved for lack of expenditure. The question of a reduction in the expenditure had been raised, but he did not believe that any reduction was either possible or desirable. As civilisation grew and expanded the demands upon the national purse must increase proportionately as humanitarian feelings increased amongst the people. They should not forget that there were at the present time 120,000 children, in London alone, going to school hungry, whereas they could and should be provided with meals at the national expense. He did not advocate, and he did not desire, any decrease in the expenditure of the nation, but he did desire that the money now being frittered away in injurious courses should be diverted to useful and fruitful objects for the benefit of all concerned. Nor did he dream of any increase of expenditure, or even the maintenance of the present expenditure being raised by further taxes upon the people, for there were other sources of revenue still to be tapped which would provide for all the requirements of government without imposing any further burdens upon the poor. Recent Returns showed that 3,700 persons had died whose combined estates were valued at £186,000,000. The surplus wealth of the nation was yearly being added to, and he felt sure that the nation would find before long an opportunity for increasing the national income without adding to the burdens of the poor. Any attempt to broaden the basis of taxation in exchange for old-age pensions or things of that kind would be resisted to the utmost by those with whom he was associated. Whilst they demanded a higher standard of expenditure, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, they insisted that it should not come from the pockets of the people but from the surpluses in the banking accounts of the over-rich.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 201; Noes, 250. (Division List No. 11.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T. Gibson (KingsLynn
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC (S. Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N. E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Farrell, James Patrick
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.

Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W)
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George

M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Thomas (W Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John

Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York., W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wills, Arthur Walters (N Dorset
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm

Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Mancr.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J E (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Sir James (Staffords NW
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks NR.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Alymer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Ed. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Visount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilon-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question [14th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth—

"*Most Gracious Sovereign,—*

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Mount.*)

Question again proposed.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.) said in moving the Amendment standing in his name he desired briefly to explain the reason this question was raised in this way rather than by way of a Bill. In the first place no Bill could deal accurately with this question unless it contained a financial provision which owing to the rule private Members could not insert, and in the second, previous experience of attempting to deal with this matter by way of Bill did not encourage the Irish Party to make further attempts in that direction. The Irish Labourers Bill brought in by the hon. Member for North Longford was a very moderate Bill making no demands on the Imperial Exchequer, but nevertheless it was bitterly opposed by the Government on Second Reading and thrown out. When the Land Act of 1903 was before the House, the Irish Members insisted that the claims of Irish labourers should be thoroughly dealt with. They failed in that, but succeeded in obtaining a promise that the claims of the Irish labourers should be dealt with in a separate Bill during the following session, and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary undertook to furnish himself, in the recess, with all the details necessary for that purpose. The right hon. Gentleman carried out that pledge according to the usual Dublin Castle methods, but the other pledge was not redeemed, for no attempt had been made to redeem it. A Bill was indicated in the King's Speech in the previous year, but it turned out to be a very bad Bill. It was introduced under the ten-minute rule and the Second Reading was deferred to the second week in June. It was then referred to the Standing Committee on Trade, where it was kept until the last week in July. It then came back to the House, when owing to the fact that certain Amendments had been carried in Committee, against the Government, the Chief Secretary refused to proceed further with it. From that day to this not the slightest indication had been given by the Government of their intention to take any steps whatever to redeem the pledge they gave. There could not be a more striking illustration of the callous indifference of the British Parliament to the needs of the Irish people or of its incapacity to legislate for Ireland. This Bill urgently needed was shamelessly abandoned, because in the course of a long session the Government would not grant a few sittings for its consideration. The situation in Ireland was truly deplorable. Day by day the flower of the population was flying from the shores of Ireland, and although the remedies lay at the hand of the Government it obstinately refused to apply them. Of course, Home Rule was the only real remedy, but still much might be done to mitigate this great evil by improving the condition of the working classes and keeping them on the soil. The Irish were accused of disloyalty, but how could people be loyal to a Government which looked calmly on while their country bled to death without making the slightest attempt to bind up its wounds. If it was desired to preserve the remnant of the Irish race there was no time to spare. Money would, of course be necessary, but there ought to be no difficulty with regard to that, because in common fairness, as the British Government was the cause of all this, the British Treasury should bear the burden. The trouble would never have arisen except for the ill-fated Act of Union for, under an Irish Parliament, Irish industries would have prospered and the Irish labourer have been given a foothold in the land of his birth. He begged to move.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.), in seconding the Motion, said it was because of the magnitude of the question and the fact that thousands of the best people were leaving Ireland, that the Nationalist Members took this matter up. These labourers were wanted at home to develop the country, but in order that they might do that it was necessary that they should be paid a wage equivalent to that which they could earn elsewhere. It was also necessary to give them comfortable homes and plots of land on reasonable terms. It was impossible to pay the wages given in other countries and give them better accommodation without assistance, and therefore they asked that the Government should come to the assistance of Ireland by making a grant which would assist her in keeping these people, whose services she required, at home. Money was required in this matter. The Government charged £4 16s. 10d. for £100 under the Labourers Act, and £3 5s. under the Land Act. If there was to be any distinction drawn between the two one would have thought that the poor man would have had the benefit of it. But the explanation was that the landlords had no interest in the labourers question. Had they been interested the rate of interest would have been reduced and a bonus added. Year after year in this House Irish Members had experience of shattered hopes and broken pledges, but never had they had a more shocking experience of broken pledges than the Labourers Bill of the previous year. In 1903 the Irish Members accepted the pledge given by the Chief Secretary to deal with this matter in the forthcoming session, because they thought the right hon. Gentleman was sincere; they went to Ireland and pacified the labourers there, whom they found discontented, and made them hopeful, and what had been the result? Betrayal again. The Chief Secretary sent his inspectors round to get the information, but although they had asked for the inspectors' reports to be laid upon the Table their request had been refused. Like the Land Bill of the previous year, the Labourers Bill was held over to the last days of the session. It was then sent upstairs, where the Amendments proposed by the Nationalist Members were carried by majorities of seven to one. Those majorities were composed of Nationalists, Unionists, Liberals, and Tories, but in spite of the unanimity with which those Amendments were carried the Chief Secretary refused to go on with the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary said before the Land Bill was passed that unless all were agreed upon it the land question could not be settled. The right hon. Gentleman made use of the same words almost on the question of education, but in regard to the Labourers Bill the right hon. Gentleman had no occasion to say it. Everybody voted one way, in favour of the Amendments moved by Nationalist Members. All Parties were united in the desire to see justice done to the Irish labourer except the Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, and the result was the Bill was withdrawn. No reason was given. So far as could be gathered, the Treasury had stepped in and said it was not prepared to give money at a cheap rate of interest. It was perfectly shameful that a small concession could not have been made to benefit the Irish labourers. The hon. Member for East Waterford tried to impress on the Government that the clauses were not sufficient, and the Nationalist Members proposed Amendments, which were scouted.

From a Return issued on December 31st last, it appeared that the applications for loans in Ireland under the Land Purchase Act was 31,651, the amount of money required being £13,058,043. The number of applications granted was 8,791, and the loans sanctioned by the Estates Commissioners amounted to £4,408,829. Two days ago he asked the Chief Secretary whether the Land Commissioners in the purchase of estates had brought into operation the statutory powers which enabled them to make provision for the labourers on the estates. What had happened in this matter showed how incompetent any English Government was to manage the affairs of Ireland when they would not attend to the advice of hon. Members who did understand them. While there were 31,651 applications for loans by tenant farmers there were only thirty-six labourers recommended. He could not get a better example of the stupidity of the men who sat on the bench opposite in dealing with Irish affairs. Experience of the Labourers Act showed that it had been cumbersome, costly, and tedious. He knew from his own experience in connection with the working of the Act that there was a great deal of red tape practised by the Local Government Board, and it took about five years to complete a scheme. In these matters they had generally to encounter the opposition of the landlords. The local boards had to provide the expenses of the inspectors who were sent down, although they were not allowed any voice in their selection. The result was that landlords' solicitors volunteered to appear when the inquiries were held and they opposed the erection of cottages. And why? For the simple reason that they knew that their expenses would have to be paid. An overwhelming majority of the men who held inquiries were in sympathy with the landlords, and for the slightest reason the applicant was turned out of Court. Some of the tenant farmers had not been so generous as they might have been, but he thought the majority had done very well. What they wanted principally in these cases was to get loans at cheap rates. They claimed that the Irish labourer had as good a right as, if not more right, than the bloated landlords to get money at 3¼ per cent. They wanted also—and this was very important—to get a simplification of the methods of procedure, and to get the red tape done away with. His belief was that while this matter was in the hands of the Local Government Board in Dublin they might as well think of turning the tide by blowing their breath as to think that they were going to get rid of the official red tape with which they were so much bound up.

The representatives of Ulster last year were enthusiastic for the Labourers Bill, and they were anxious now that a measure should be introduced. A few figures in regard to the position of Ulster in this matter as compared with other parts of Ireland might be interesting to the House. The number of cottages authorised to be built in Munster was 11,435, while the number authorised to be built in Ulster was 1,239. He might mention that in county Tipperary alone the number of cottages built was 1,169. In that county they had done their part at any rate. They expected that when the Labourers Bill fell through last year a Bill would have been introduced this year on the same subject. Here they were, a fortnight after the opening of Parliament, and what had been the experience? Ireland blocked the way once more, and it would continue to do so until they got their rights conceded. Much as the Nationalist Members might have cause to complain of the conduct of the Chief Secretary on this question and on other great Irish questions, they must admit that he approached them in a very different manner from the Irish Attorney-General. During his experience in that House he had never heard the Attorney-General utter a kind or sympathetic sentence in connection with any question which they had brought up. While they could make allowances for the prejudices which they believed to be due to ignorance of Irish sentiment and affairs, there was no person more distasteful to Irishmen than an anti-Irishman. The Irish representatives were firmly resolved to force a solution of this great labour problem. Whoever might be the occupants of the Government front bench they were resolved on fighting it out. The position of the Irish labourers differed very much from that of the English labourers. They or their fathers had been the victims of the tyrannical and ruthless landlord system of Ireland, a system which the Prime Minister had declared to be the very worst in the world. The Irish labourers were as entitled to good treatment as any section of the Irish community, and the Irish Members were determined to do all in their power to help them.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that this House expresses regret that no promise has been made to deal during the present Session with the pressing need for the improvement of the condition of the labourers in Ireland, notwithstanding the complete unanimity which exists upon the Question amongst all sections of the Irish representation.'" — (*Captain Donelan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said there was very little to quarrel with in the terms of the Amendment, or with the speeches in which it had been moved and seconded. He did not agree with the closing sentences of the hon. Member who seconded the Amendment. He could state on behalf of his Unionist colleagues, who represented Irish constituencies, that they had very great sympathy with this Amendment. They must all admit the hard case of the labourers in Ireland, and he believed that in all parts of the House they were anxious for an opportunity of remedying the existing condition of things. He thought it was on the Government side of the House that sympathy was first practically expressed with the condition of the Irish labourers. [NATIONALIST laughter.] He would not quarrel with hon. Gentlemen opposite in regard to that. He did know that they were united on both sides of the House on the question of the farm labourers in Ireland. When the Chief Secretary introduced his Land Bill a great number of appeals were made to him to do something practical and definite for the labourers as well as the tenant farmers. The result was that the Chief Secretary promised in the most definite way a large and generous measure for dealing with the labourers. Last session a Bill was actually produced, but it was utterly and totally inadequate to fulfil either the promise which was made by the Government or the pledges which were given by Members who represented Irish agricultural constituencies. It was condemned in every quarter of the House, but it had, at all events, this merit, that it created for perhaps the first time in Irish history a united Irish Party. It emerged from the Committee in such a shattered and battered condition that it was rapidly withdrawn by the Chief Secretary on behalf of the Government. This session, unfortunately, there had been no attempt whatever to deal with this great question, but the urgent need for something being done speedily remained. He was afraid that there was no attempt made to deal with this matter during the recess, because the Chief Secretary was engaged in other schemes not perhaps so fruitful of good for Ireland as this one would have been. Hon. Members from Ireland, to whatever part they belonged, were bound to try to

get pledges fulfilled in as near a future as they could achieve that result.

If this Amendment had been moved in the form of a Resolution the Irish Unionists, much as they naturally disliked any Resolution coming from the benches opposite, would have felt compelled to vote for it, but as the form of the Resolution had been altered and as it now came in the form of an Amendment to the Address they could not vote for it. If carried it would turn out the Government. He was not sure that that particular result would break the hearts of hon. Members sitting opposite, but it would put somebody else in office. He and his hon. friends could not forget that lately a very definite statement and a very definite pledge was given by the Leader of the Opposition that he still adhered to the old form of Home Rule introduced by Mr. Gladstone. Did the right hon. Gentleman deny that? The present condition of things was bad and trying enough, but the Unionist Members from Ulster felt that there might be something worse. The right hon. Gentleman declared in clear and definite terms that he intended, if he got into power, to hand them over to the domination of Home Rule. Therefore they felt that they could not vote for the Amendment. What they knew of the history and aims of hon. Members opposite made them feel that they could not go into the lobby with them in support of the Amendment. While, however, they could not vote with hon. Members opposite, they felt that until some more definite pledge of repentance was given by the Unionist Government to the Unionist Party they could not vote with it. Therefore on this occasion, as they had generally done of late on Irish affairs, Ulster Members as a Party would abstain.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said the speech to which they had just listened was a delightful example of that illogical and inconsistent but highly patriotic spirit in which some hon. Gentlemen approached the consideration of anything relating to the welfare of Ireland, and especially the misery, degradation and poverty in which the unfortunate Irish labourer was sunk. They acknowledged that the condition of the labourer in Ulster was more deplorable than in any other part of Ireland, yet because the Leader of the Opposition, who might or might not come into power, made an observation last week in regard to Home Rule, the representatives of Ulster could not vote for the Amendment which was intended to advance the cause of the labourers. There was something melancholy in having to bring forward an Amendment of this kind. The grievance of the Irish labourers was a fact that stood out beyond all controversy, and all Parties, irrespective of race, politics and religion, recognised that the demand now made for a remedy was urgent, and yet the Government did not dare to come forward last year or this year with an adequate remedy. The young manhood and the young womanhood of Ireland were leaving the country on account of the want of employment, and the Government would not provide a remedy for the deplorable state of things which they themselves recognised as existing. In the King's Speech last year a Labourers Bill was promised, and it was introduced on March 9th, under the ten-minutes rule which limited discussion, but even then the defects of the measure were pointed out by the Leader of the Irish Party. The Second Reading was fixed for March 21st, but it was not taken till June 24th. Notwithstanding urgent entreaties from both sides of the House, the Government kept the Bill locked up for four months, when the most valuable moments of the session were passing by. Irish Members of all sections were anxious to facilitate the measure in every possible way, but facilities were not given, and on the last day of the session the Government withdrew the Bill which had been amended by the Irish representatives with the help of their English allies. It was a sad and striking commentary on the ability of an Imperial Parliament to legislate properly and satisfactorily for Ireland. The Chief Secretary very often professed great sympathy with Ireland and for Irish measures. He was not inclined to speak lightly of the sympathy of anyone, but sympathy which found expression in such a poor practical manner was not of much use to the Irish labourers. The right hon. Gentleman said that he had been anxious to see the position of the labourers improved and when the Bill was sent upstairs it was all very well to say nice things about them. But why was the Bill dropped? It was not a pleasant thing to speak a bad word about one's own fellow-countryman, but from bitter experience he was bound to do so in regard to the general attitude of the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney-General for Ireland. He had been many years in the House, and on no matter concerning Ireland, were it great or small, had he ever heard the right hon. Gentleman say one word of sympathy towards any class of the working population of Ireland. He would conclude by quoting an observation made by a distinguished man in regard to the appalling and distressing emigration from Ireland—

> "Every strong and energetic Irishman who leaves these shores—and it is the strongest and most energetic who are leaving them—is a valuable asset substracted from our national wealth. For the chief wealth of every nation is to be found not in its native products, but in the living brains and muscles, without which no native products, however valuable, can be turned to good account. Is this a process that we can view with equanimity? There can be no doubt as to the answer, and if there was a policy which could justly be described as 'penny wise and pound foolish' it is the policy which would withhold from Ireland the funds that may be required to enable her sons to find remunerative employment at home."

These words were uttered in regard to emigration by Lord Dudley, the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

*Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said that the question of the state of the labourers in Ireland was as important and pressing to-day as it was two or even five years ago. As the present Government which held power in this country was visibly drawing to an end of its career, it might almost appear at first sight not worth while at that time to draw attention to the woes and misfortunes of the labourers. There were men on the opposite side of the House who would soon be in power, and although his remarks might not have great effect upon them they might be of some use. At any rate he hoped that when they came into power they would look to Ireland and see what was required to alleviate the condition of the agricultural labourers there. The present Chief

Secretary had dealt with this matter in very much the same way as he had dealt with another matter lately before the House, viz., with a considerable amount of reserve and a minimum amount of straightforwardness. In 1903, during the debates on the Land Bill, the Chief Secretary told them that, owing to the exigencies of time and the state of public business, he could not deal fully with the labourers' question in that measure, but he promised to bring in a Bill in the following session. Although the Irish Members were disappointed they accepted the Chief Secretary's word, as they were all anxious to secure the passage of the Land Bill, and at the end of the session they returned to their constituencies and did their best to lighten the disappointment of the labourers by telling them, on the strength of the promise of the Chief Secretary, that the whole question would be dealt with exhaustively in the following session. However, the Chief Secretary only kept his promise to the letter and not in the spirit. The right hon. Gentleman introduced a Bill which everybody knew was absolutely worthless, containing a number of provisions which nobody asked for, and leaving out most important amendments in the law which had been demanded for years; and bad as the Bill was, it contained in Section 13 a provision which was nothing more nor less than a covert invitation to hon. Gentlemen opposite to do a little barefaced robbery. [NATIONALIST cries of "Oh, oh!"] That was the only good point in the Bill from the point of view of hon. Gentlemen opposite. The Bill was so skilfully drawn that it could be wrecked by the Chief Secretary at any moment and the blame laid on hon. Gentlemen opposite, or on himself and his colleagues. The loss that would have been incurred by the operation of Clause 13 would have fallen to the greatest extent on the counties of Antrim, Down, and Armagh, and the representatives of these counties would have been very foolish indeed if they had allowed that provision to go through. Clause 13 was withdrawn, and then there was a perfect avalanche of Amendments of hon. Members opposite which would have reduced the Bill to a shapeless mass.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that the Amendments of the Irish Party had all been put down before that change was announced; and the Bill was withdrawn by the Government because an Amendment was carried which was supported by the hon. Gentleman.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he could only repeat that the Bill was so cleverly drawn that it was bound to be killed by one side or the other. In fact, it ought to have been killed at the outset it was so bad. He supposed the Chief Secretary thought he had fulfilled his pledge by introducing the Bill, but Irishmen of all shades of opinion knew that they had been trifled with and humbugged. Whatever praises of landlords and tenants the right hon. Gentleman carried away with him when he left Ireland, he would only carry from Irish labourers a record of disappointed hopes. For no class of his fellow-countrymen had less been done, and it was a class little able to make its voice felt. He trusted that, by the introduction of labourers' associations and their better organisation, the time would shortly come when it would be impossible for any Government any longer to disregard the claims and demands of the Irish labourers.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Or of any supposed friends of theirs.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that he might be permitted to say what were, in his opinion, the chief respects in which the labourers' code ought to be amended. In the first place, there must be cheaper money; then the simplification of procedure; next the provision of guarantees that the Acts should be properly administered; and lastly, on which he laid particular stress, that provision should be made by which deserving labourers would be able to become the owners of their houses and their plots of land. The labourers' question was part and parcel of the land question, and until that had been fully settled it would be impossible to say that the Irish land question had been definitely set at rest. As to cheaper money, in counties where the Exchequer Grant had been exhausted, and consequently where the expense of administering the Labourers Acts had to be borne by the rates, the existing rate of interest for advances was so high that it involved a very heavy burden upon the ratepayers which District Councils were reluctant to impose. He did not pretend that a labourer's cottage and plot of land was as good a security as a large farm, but the present rate of interest was altogether too high compared with that charged under the Land Purchase Act of 1903. There was no reason why the labourers should not have the benefit of a portion of the bonus. Again, everyone who had had to do with the Labourers Acts had been appalled by the number of superfluous and useless proceedings necessary to put them into operation. No fewer than nineteen different processes had to be gone through for the provision of a cottage and plot costing from £70 to £100, and the expense of these frequently amounted to £30 or £40. There was very great room for improvement there. He admitted that the policy of allowing labourers to become the owners of their own houses and plots of land was a controversial question, but he himself saw no reason in the world why they should not. It would be a great inducement to them to stay on the land, especially in the South and West of Ireland. He knew it would be his duty to oppose on many points the Government which would succeed the present one, but he hoped that when they succeeded to power they would introduce a labourers' measure with which he could agree; and if they adopted the numerous suggestions which had been made from different parts of the House it would give him great pleasure to assist them in passing it into law.

*Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) said he desired to congratulate his hon. friend on the manner in which he had moved the Amendment. He was of opinion that the labour question in Ireland was just as important as the land question. The two appeared to him to be bound up in each other; and one could not be finally settled without settling the other also. He regarded the labour question just as he regarded the land question as of national concern; and he firmly believed that until the labourers got decent houses with suitable plots attached to enable them to live in comfort, emigration would continue to the great loss of the nation. It was with view to checking this deadly plague of emigration that he hoped the labourers' question would be settled by some Government in the near future. Indeed, he thought the Government ought to have spared them the necessity of bringing forward this Amendment; because, as his hon. friend had said, when the Land Act of 1903 was passing through the House the Chief Secretary led them to believe that the Government would tackle the question in the following session and deal with it in a drastic manner. He himself left the House at the end of that session under the impression that the Government would bring in a comprehensive Labourers Bill the following year. They all knew what happened; and they knew how the Government acted, how they disappointed and betrayed the labourers by introducing a worthless Bill, the only saving clause in which—Clause 13—was withdrawn at the instance of Members from the North of Ireland. After that the Bill was worthless. It would not have reduced the enormous expenditure in connection with the administration of the Acts; it would not have simplified the procedure; and it would not have provided cheap money for the working of the Acts. When his colleagues and himself tried to make something of that Bill by improving its financial clauses the Chief Secretary withdrew it altogether. He characterised that act then, and would repeat it now, as shabby and contemptible. It was a strong reminder to him that they should not rely on the promises of British Ministers, but should work for themselves. They were told that the Government could not get the money for the Labourers Acts on Land Act terms; but the Chief Secretary, when the Land Bill was in Committee, did not inform them of that when he induced them to postpone the labourers' question. He should like to know from the Attorney-General what there was to prevent the Government from getting money for the labourers on Land Act terms? One was as great a public question as the other. The Government could get plenty of money for other purposes, but when it was a question of improving the position of the working man in Ireland, so that he might live in comfort, no money was to be forthcoming. Last year hope was held out because the question was mentioned in the King's Speech; but this year not a word was said about it. How shabby all that appeared to be on the part of the Government. He mentioned these facts to show how necessary it was to bring forward this Amendment. He regretted that the rules of the House prevented private Members from introducing Bills containing financial proposals; otherwise his hon. friend would have brought in a Bill.

As for the merits of the Amendment, he himself had attended many labour meetings in the South of Ireland, especially in his own constituency, and had spoken to resolutions proposed at them; and he might safely say that he knew what the labourers wanted in the South of Ireland. In the first place, they wanted the Labourers Acts simplified, and the cost of administration reduced; they also wanted an extension of power under local and public control. Everyone knew that there was too much red tape about the Labourers Acts. Sixteen different steps had to be taken before a scheme could be completed, and after that the time taken for carrying out the scheme was altogether too long, occupying as it did, three, four, or even five years. Then, again, too much of the ratepayers' money was wasted in official expenses. The cost of proving title was very great; indeed, sometimes as great as the value of the plot. He believed that the same routine had to be observed to prove title to an acre or half acre as to prove title to an estate. All that enormous expense had to be borne by the ratepayers. The labourers wanted to have these matters rectified, together with other defects in the Acts. Further, the labourers in his constituency wanted, after the claims of the evicted tenants had been satisfied, to see the grass lands purchased by the Estates Commissioners divided up into plots and given to them. They wanted the land at a fair price and at the same interest as under the Act of 1903. Anyone who had studied the question fairly and impartially would admit that these demands were not extravagant. He advocated them because he believed them to be just. He considered the question to be most pressing. Everyone knew that Irish workers, especially agricultural labourers, were flying from the shores of Ireland like wild geese, to seek a livelihood in foreign lands which they could not get at home. It was their duty to try and help those who could not help themselves, and it was in the interests of Ireland that something should be done in this direction. If Ireland had a Parliament of her own the question would not be delayed twenty-four hours, because everyone was agreed that it was a matter which should be dealt with at once. The remedy for this state of affairs was not very far to find. Let them give the labourers plots of land at a fair price on Land Act terms, and he ventured to say that the problem would be solved. In that way they would be doing a great national work by raising the *status* of the working man from a condition of squalor and want to that of happiness and comfort, which would instil into his mind the principles of thrift, self-respect, and sobriety. They would make him something more than a hewer of wood and a drawer of water. They would revive in him the old Celtic spirit, a love of home and country; thus the spirit of discontent which now exists would pass away, and Ireland would keep her sons at home, to work for her prosperity and regeneration.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.) said that many speakers had referred to the present methods of procedure, but in his own constituency they had built a thousand cottages, whereas comparatively few cottages had been built in Antrim and other counties in the North, although the procedure was exactly the same. There was too much of the *ex-officio* element in the North; but they in the South were sound, honest farmers and carried out the law. They had been told that a great amount of expense had to be incurred in proving title; but an inspector could be brought down for 150 cases just as well as for one, and the cost would be the same. Last year they endeavoured to improve the Labourers Bill in Committee, but the Chief Secretary whittled it away and at last withdrew it body and bones. They pleaded that the Bill should be carried through, as did also the hon. Member for South

Belfast, but the Chief Secretary was not to be cajoled by the hon. Member for South Belfast or the eloquence of the Irish Members. What they wanted mainly was cheap money to carry out the Acts on the same terms as the Land Act. There had never been a failure on the part of the labourers to discharge their liabilities, although the Acts had been in operation for twenty-two years. He did not see why money should not be obtained as cheaply under the Labourers Acts as under the Land Act. At present his constituency was at a standstill with regard to all the Acts; they were in a position in which they could neither lead nor drive. There was not a word in the King's Speech about Ireland, although there was a covert insinuation that her representation would be lowered; but if there was any attempt in that direction, they would know the reason why. Although the Acts had been halting and lame, still they conferred considerable benefits on the labourers.

He remembered the time when a man with a decent suit of clothes would not have been safe in entering a labourer's cottage, as soot was always dropping from the roof. During his travels in America he had seen in the Southern States the slaves described in "Uncle Tom's Cabin"; he saw them herded together, but they were well-clothed and well-fed. He had seen labourers in Ireland with their wives and children huddled together in one little room; he knew of cases of that sort to-day; and yet the great English nation had not one word of sympathy for them; no money could be found for them, although millions could be found to deprive a small country in South Africa of its liberty. Money could be found for every man but the Irishman. The Celts were still going with a vengeance, as in 1847, but they would return with a vengeance also. The Irish Members would continue to press this question to the front. They had plenty of land in Ireland if they could only get fair play. They had ranches miles in extent on the eleven months system with one herd tending perhaps 500 cattle. Five hundred labourers could be employed on that ranch. In his own constituency seventy-three acres of land was to be disposed of, and there were seventy-three labourers to be provided with homes. He suggested to the landlord that each labourer should be given one acre; but he refused. The land was put up for sale, but not a perch of it was sold. Now there were thirty-five labourers on that land on fair terms. That was how he managed that landlord. All they really wanted was the loan of a few pounds to be paid back by instalments. Under the Land Act there was not a farthing in every £100 lent due to the Government; and in like manner the labourers would also pay back. He wished that the North of Ireland was acting with the South in this matter. They could not ride two horses at the same time, especially when one was trotting to the sound of the Orange drum and the other was facing towards the sunny South.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) heartily associated himself with the timely demand that had been made upon the Government on behalf of a very needful class. The circumstances under which the Amendment had to be discussed were to be regretted, because the hopes and prospects of the labourers had been blighted by the promises made by the Government when the Land Bill was before the House. The Land Act would never have had its passage facilitated by all Parties had it not been for the definite promise of a large and comprehensive measure dealing with the labourers' question. The speeches that had been made by both Irish Parties really pledged them to support any Motion or effort made to better the condition of the labourers. They were honourably bound, from what they knew of the real facts, not to close their eyes to the legitimacy of their claims. When the Bill went up to the Standing Committee the Government must have understood that no Labourers Bill would be acceptable that did not contain reasonable financial clauses. The absence of these clauses was evidence to him that the promises were hypocritical. No other conclusion could be drawn. The labourers were a very industrious class and certainly deserved great credit for the manner in which they had organised themselves and the modesty with which they had put forward their demands. As to the sympathy of the Chief Secretary, that sympathy had been repudiated because it had not been carried into practice. Where there was sympathy there should be practice.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Then vote for this Motion.

Mr. SLOAN: With all respect to the hon. and learned Member, I am not aware that he is my leader.

An HON. MEMBER: Who is your leader?

Mr. SLOAN: My own conscience, and that is more than many hon. Gentlemen opposite can say. Continuing, the hon. Member submitted that the Attorney-General bad shown no tinge of sympathy whatever in this matter. So far as he himself was concerned, there was no man on those benches more desirous to solve the problem, because he knew the life these poor fellows led and the hovels they inhabited, which were not only uncomfortable but insanitary, and certainly held out no inducement for any young man who could find better employment elsewhere to stay in Ireland. No doubt many young fellows emigrated because of these very undesirable conditions. The Bill of last session was wilfully obstructed. [Nationalist cries of "No."] The hon. Member for Waterford said he would not take the responsibillty of rejecting the Second Reading and prevent it going into Grand Committee, but every Member agreed that the efforts of the Government to give them a measure acceptable to the labourers were futile, and, as a consequence, they obstructed the Bill. The whole crux of the question was reached when they came to the financial proposals. Members from both sides of the House then put their heads together to see if they could make the Government favourable towards the financial difficulties. It was then that they carried an Amendment by an overwhelming majority, and the Chief Secretary withdrew the Bill on behalf of the Government. That was in the face of a distinct pledge, and it placed every Irish Member in a very false position before his constituents. Surely it ought not to be impossible for the Government to make some amends whereby simplification of procedure could be attained. If the Government lasted another session he did not believe they would pass a Bill. They had broken their promise, and they were humiliated as much as they could be. It was a scandal that Irish Members should have to tell their constituents that they had cried in the ears of the Government, that they had knocked at their door, and that when it was opened there was no one in. He urged the Government to make a clear and straightforward statement as to whether it was their intention seriously to grapple with this question, and whether the labourers were to have any hope in this matter from a Unionist Government.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) regretted the unavoidable absence of the Chief Secretary for Ireland for several reasons—first, because if he were present he could himself answer for the promises he had made; and, secondly, because he would have had an opportunity of appreciating at their true value former expressions of sympathy and gratitude from hon. Members opposite, who now almost accused him of stooping to introduce a Bill which he never meant to pass. As for himself, he had been accused of having no sympathy with any Irish object or class; but those who knew him knew that that was false, and he should never go out of his way to win the approval of those who made such accusations. From the course of the discussion it was obvious that the Gentlemen who had spoken had two different objects in view. Some of them apparently desired that a scheme should be framed, which should be embodied in an Act and passed, providing better accommodation for labourers according to the requirements of the district, in the words of the Act of 1883. Others would not be satisfied unless some provision were made under which the grazing lands of Ireland should be divided up into small uneconomical holdings and sold to the tenants.

*__Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY__ said what they wanted was that, after the claims of the evicted tenants had been satisfied, the untenanted grazing land should be purchased by the Estates Commissioners, broken up into small holdings, and the labourers given as much land as would feed a cow and provide corn and vegetables in them.

MR. ATKINSON said possibly he had done the hon. Member an injustice then in saying uneconomical holdings, the test being that a man should keep a cow, though possibly not extending to the historic three acres. He only referred to the matter to point out that his right hon. friend's promise, made at the passing of the Act of 1903, only applied to the first class of questions—namely, the provision of adequate accommodation for the housing of the labourers in each particular district. It was undoubtedly true that his right hon. friend did make a promise to bring in a comprehensive measure. He brought in a measure, and, although his right hon. friend never concealed from the House that he was unable to get money at a cheap rate, so far as the other portions of the scheme were concerned, he confidently submitted that that measure, as brought in, was a great improvement on all the previous Labourers Acts, and did a great deal to cheapen and simplify procedure. The first thing the Bill proposed was to place the county councils in the position of the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board in the position occupied in recent legislation by the Committee of the Privy Council. He was, therefore, astonished when the gentlemen who clamoured most loudly for popular right proved to be the most strenuous objectors to the placing of the administration of that measure in the hands of the local authorities. In addition to that, Amendments were put down which would have had the effect of considerably cheapening and expediting procedure. But what was the fate of the Bill? There was no opposition to the Second Reading.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): We divided the House against it.

MR. ATKINSON said that, at any rate, there was no real opposition. The Bill then went upstairs, and when only the ninth line had been reached it was arranged that a new financial clause proposing to enable local authorities to borrow in the open market for a term of sixty years should be brought up and discussed in priority to the other Amendments. On the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for North Down, an Amendment was carried substituting eighty years for sixty years, and that at once put an end to the Bill, as it was obviously impossible to get money for such a term on the security offered. He did not think his right hon. friend had been fairly treated in this matter. Hon. Members opposite asked why, if money could be obtained for the purchase of the land, it could not be obtained for the labourers? He thoroughly sympathised with the labourers, but the vehemence with which Irish Nationalist Members were now pressing the claims of the labourers was in strange contrast with the silence which was observed on the labourers' claims so long as they were working for the tenant farmers. [Cries of "No, no!"] His right hon. friend never promised in 1903 that he would introduce a Bill which would enable them to get money at the same rate as it was got for the Land Purchase Bill. Hon. Members asked why they could not get money for the Labourers Bill at the same rate as for the Land Bill, but they seemed to forget that the rate on the Land Bill had turned out much more expensive than there was reason to expect. His right hon. friend had used all the pressure on the Treasury that was possible, but the Treasury had refused to give money at a rate at all corresponding to the rate given on the Land Bill. The money could not now be obtained except at an enormous sacrifice and outlay to the British taxpayer. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: And the Irish taxpayer.] He thought that was an adequate reason why the Treasury had refused to grant money, which could not be obtained even at a rate at all corresponding to the rate at which they were willing to advance money for the purchase of land, to effect a settlement of the land question in Ireland.

The hon. Member who moved this Motion said that there was a pressing need for dealing with this question, and it ought to be met this year by legislation. He wished to call the attention of the House to the progress which had been made up to the present moment. Notwithstanding the fact that the Bill of last year fell through, the number of cottages authorised during twenty-two years up to January 31st, 1905, was 23,118, and since then provisional orders had been made for 1,628 more. The interesting thing about this was that the progress since January 31st was at a greatly increased rate. Besides this, within the last ten months 2,431 cottages had been authorised, at an expense of £200,000, and gratuities to the amount of £323,000 had been granted.

Mr. SLOAN: What does the right hon. Gentleman mean by gratuities?

Mr. ATKINSON said these gratuities were advances made out of the Local Taxation Account. He thought it was satisfactory to know that notwithstanding the fact that the Bill had fallen through, some progress had been made, and it had been made at a much more rapid rate than at any period since the year 1883. Although it was most desirable that this question should be settled, the falling-through of last year's Bill had not deterred local bodies from taking advantage of the Acts now in operation. He still thought that the measure introduced last year could have been made a good measure, although it fell short of providing money at a cheap rate of interest.

He had been asked to give them some assurance in regard to a Bill to be introduced this year. He could give the assurance that the Government would be willing to bring in their last Bill amended in such a way as to expedite still further the carrying out of the scheme; but he could not give an assurance that money would be provided at a cheaper rate. To that project the Treasury were opposed. He wished that he were able to give a more satisfactory response to the appeals that had been made. The hon. Member opposite had stated that he was forced to bring forward this Motion because he could not bring in a Bill dealing with financial matters. He did not see what there was to prevent his hon. friend bringing in a Bill, and he should be very pleased if he would do so. He thought those who talked so flippantly about the ease with which the procedure in regard to labourers' cottages could be cheapened and expedited would find that the task was not so easy if they endeavoured to approach it in practice. In the first place they must have the district council as the local authority to work the scheme, and there must be some authority above them to approve of what they did. They must also have some means of ascertaining what compensation was to be paid to those persons whose land was taken. This was not such a simple thing as some hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House seemed to think. In many cases he thought the compensation given for land was extravagant, but he thought a great advance could be made in cheapening the process if they provided a model cottage which could be followed without the necessity of having separate plans in each particular case. In regard to the charge that the Unionist Party were not anxious to promote this reform he wished to point out that most important Acts dealing with this very question were passed by the present Government in 1891, 1892, and 1896; and in the Land Act of last year clauses were inserted to secure the more effectual housing of agricultural labourers. He was sorry that he was not able to give them any further assurances in regard to the introduction of a measure dealing with this question.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said that it was to be regretted that the debate had taken place in the absence of the Chief Secretary, who had given the pledges which they complained had not been fulfilled. Those pledges were followed up by the introduction of a useless Bill. For his own part, he did not intend occupying the time of the House in making an attack, especially under existing circumstances, upon an absent man. He would, however, speak of the Government as a whole. He congratulated the Attorney-General for Ireland on the way in which he had conducted his portion of the debate. He had more than once, on similar occasions, had to complain of the tone adopted by the right hon. Gentleman and the amount of irritation he was in the habit of importing into Irish debates. On the whole he thought on this occasion that, for him, he had been fairly successful. As far as he could remember the right hon. Gentleman had only made one irritating and somewhat insulting challenge across the floor of the House. He had said that the vehemence with which the Irish Members were pressing the claims of the labourers was in strange contrast with the silence which was observed on the labourers' claims so long as they were working for the tenant farmers. That was an irritating and a most offensive insinuation, and one which had not one particle of foundation. If the right hon. Gentleman were a new Member this insinuation might be excusable, but he had sat in the House for many years, and had witnessed the Irish Party introducing Labourers Bills for the last twenty years, and he (the Attorney-General) had taken a very prominent part in opposing and securing the rejection of those Bills. Therefore, he thought the taunt which he had flung across the floor of the House was quite unmerited. These Irish questions were, no doubt, irritating to English Members, but this was chiefly owing to the fact that they did not understand them. They were so vehement on the labourers' question, first because the labourers of Ireland, an industrious and hard-working class of men, had been inhabiting squalid cabins, and they desired to remove that reproach from their country and to give decent habitations to this deserving class; and, secondly, because of the great part which the labourers had played in the political history of their country.

The right hon. Gentleman gave an erroneous account of the claims of the labourers. He said there was apparently one section of Irish Members who were asking merely for the amelioration of the conditions of the labourers, and another section who were asking to have the labourers turned into occupiers of small uneconomic holdings. He did not believe that in any part of Ireland there was any feeling in favour of the second course suggested. What was desired was that labourers, as a class, should not be shut out from any access to the land and from any possibility of rising to the position of farmers. In the Labourers Bill of last year that opportunity was provided, and it was one of the few clauses in the Bill that were worth having. The Bill of last year was a worthless Bill. Irish opinion was united on that point. He was told there were 250,000 labourers in Ireland, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman asked them to congratulate themselves on the fact that 23,000 of them had obtained cottages in the course of twenty-three years! That was an absurd claim to put forward. What they desired was to amend the Labourers Acts so as to make the procedure rapid and cheap. At present, for every labourer's cottage built, the ratepayers of a district had to pay an annual fine of between £5 and £6 a year, because, although they could get money for land purchase at 2¾ per cent., they could not get money under 4 per cent. for building labourers' cottages. He did not know what the hon. Member for Belfast was going to do in regard to this Amendment, whether or not he was going to walk out when the division was called. He had listened with great interest to the speech he had made in which he denounced men who had nothing but words of sympathy for the Irish labourers, and would not take any sympathetic action. The words of the hon. Member for South Belfast were sympathetic, but was he going to take any sympathetic action. It was moonshine and nonsense to pretend that by voting for this Amendment they would be installing a Home Rule Government in office. He trusted that the labourers of Ireland would appraise that kind of sympathy at its proper value, and refuse to give their support to those Gentlemen who got up in the House of Commons and denounced the Chief Secretary for not taking sympathetic action in regard to the labourers, yet were afraid to back their opinions by their votes, and who walked ignominiously out of the House when the division came on.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 184; Noes, 228. (Division List No. 12.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth ,John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, RtHn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin,Charles Ramsay(Galw'y
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,Capt.E.C.(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans,Sir Francis H(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander(LanarkNE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt.Hn. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan,Col. John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer,Sir CharlesM.(Durham)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills,Arthur Walters(N.Dorset
Wilson,Fred. W. (Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour,Rt HnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Lt-Col. H.F.(Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V. C. W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt HnJ.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne,T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke,Rt.Hon.Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,Sir R.B.(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson,Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin & Nairn
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Henry D. Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Sir James(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope J.F. (Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John (Kent,F'versh'm
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. GeoT. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,Hn. H.L.W. (Mile End
Lawson,JohnGrant (YorksNR.
Lee,Arthur H(Hants.Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut-Col. A. R.
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Milner,Rt.Hon.Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,David J.(Walthamst'w
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel,Hn.Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild,Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart,Sir H.(Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,HC (North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir MarkJ.M‘Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)

Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES — Sir Alexander Acland Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after Midnight, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, Mr. Speaker proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 180. (Division List No. 13.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A J (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt-Col H F (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J H M (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chath'm
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon Sir John E
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt Hon Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederic
Gordon, Hn J E (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Sir James (Staffords NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt Hn Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon Geo T (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn H L W (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks NR
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel

Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt Hn Sir Frederick G
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesl'y
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyn's'de
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt Hon Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col A C E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G E (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W H (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn E R (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hn Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galw'y
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt E C (S Andr'ws Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grey, Rt Hon Sir E (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin

Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowdl John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N. Dorset
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

Main Question put accordingly.

The House divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 175. (Division List No. 14.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hn, A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Invrn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Sir James (Staffords N.W
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt Hn Sir John H
Kenyon, Hn. Geo T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt Hn Col. W.
Keswick, William

Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer

Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.

Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William

Findlay, Alexander (Lanark NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael

Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas (W Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N. Dorset
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk Mid.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudd'rsfd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth:—

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household.

SUPPLY.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and that the several Estimates presented to this House during the present Session be referred to the Committee of Supply."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): I object.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! This cannot be objected to; it is under the Standing Orders.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker (MINISTERIAL cries of "Order!"), I submit that you having put a Motion from the Chair, we are entitled to say "Aye" or "No."

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have not said that you cannot say "Aye" or "No." I have said that you cannot object to its being taken after twelve o'clock.

Mr. WHITLEY said he had risen to point out that the Motion did not appear on the Notice Paper.

*Mr. SPEAKER: It never does.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Can this Motion be debated?

*Mr. SPEAKER: No. All this is irregular, as a division has been called.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 190; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 15.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardener, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir R. B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Sir James (Staffords. N. W
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W J. H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newnes, Sir George
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Co.l S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C. (North'mb Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd

Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Esmonde Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Farrell, James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Johnson, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mooney, John J.
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N. Dorset
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsfi'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Churchill.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 16.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh. O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry

Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, J H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw.H.
Cavendish, V.C.W Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim S
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies,SirHoratioD (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir WilliamTheodore
Dyke, Rt Hon.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fergusson,Rt.Hn SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir R.B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS (Warwick.S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J (Londonderry, South
Gordon, Maj Evans(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq of (L'donderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Sir James(Staffords NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge,SirRobertT
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F(Sheffield, Brightside
Howard,John(KentFaversham
Hozier, Hon.James HenryCecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hon Col.W
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, SirJoseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,Hon.H.L.W (MileEnd
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks N.R
Lee,Arthur H(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead
Leege, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,ReginaldJ (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming.
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Fredk. G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Newnes, Sir George
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon.LionelWalter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col Samuel Alexander.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Shaw-Stewart (Sir H. Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)
Smith, HC (North'mb Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt Hon.SirWilliamH
Welby, Sir Charles G. E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright Allan Heywood
Brown Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene

Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalzel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galw'y
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farrell, James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Johnson, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P (Cavan W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mooney, John J.
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Richards, Thomas (W Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N Dorset
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk Mid)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsfi'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Churchill and Mr. Trevelyan.

NEW BILL.

TRADE MARKS.

Bill to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Trade Marks, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Moulton, Mr. Eve, Mr. Cripps, Mr. Butcher, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Cawley, and Mr. Robson.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): May I draw your attention to the fact that it is now past one o'clock?

*MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I am quite aware of that. If the hon. Member will study the Standing Order he will see that when exempted business is carried over one o'clock the other business on the Paper has to be taken as if it were between twelve and one o'clock.

Bill presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 76.]

And, it being after One of the Clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at six minutes after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 2nd March, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—London and India Docks Company [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydfil Scheme Confirmation) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

DARIEN GOLD MINING COMPANY.

Petition of the Darien Gold Mining Company, Limited, under their common seal, praying for leave to introduce a Bill "To regulate the capital of the Darien Gold Mining Company, Limited, and for other purposes"; together with a copy of the proposed Bill annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a; and committed.

Central Electric Supply Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (STATISTICS OF AID GRANT UNDER VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897, 1903-1905).

Associations constituted under the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, 1903–1905.

Associated schools and amounts of aid grant paid, 1903–1905.

Unassociated schools and amounts of aid grant paid, 1903–1905.

TREATY SERIES.

No. 5 (1905).—Convention between the United Kingdom and France respecting Newfoundland and West and Central Africa; signed at London, 8th April, 1904. (Notifications exchanged at London, 8th December, 1904.)

No. 6 (1905).—Declaration between the United Kingdom and France respecting Egypt and Morocco; signed at London, 8th April, 1904.

No. 7 (1905).—Declaration between the United Kingdom and France concerning Siam, Madagascar, and the New Hebrides; signed at London, 8th April, 1904.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3326. United States (Baltimore).

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year ended 31st December, 1904.

ARMY AND MILITIA.

Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation for the year ended 30th September, 1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX).

Order made by the county council in the county of Middlesex, dividing the parish of Acton, in the Ealing Parliamentary Division, into two polling districts.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Order in Council of the 27th February, 1905, declaring that certificates for seagoing passenger steamers granted in Mauritius shall be of the same force as if granted in the United Kingdom, and that Part III. of the Act shall apply, with modifications, to such certificates.

SPRING ASSIZES ACT, 1879.

Two Orders in Council of the 27th February, 1905, relating to the ensuing intermediate Spring Assizes.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1860 TO 1904.

Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the appointment of Visiting Committees to the Prisons at Barlinnie, Perth, and Peterhead.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (MERTHYR TYDFIL SCHEME CONFIRMATION) BILL [H.L.].

Read 2ª (according to order).

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, Your Lordships will remember that in 1897 Parliament passed an Act making it possible, under certain conditions, to carry out military manœuvres in this country, and under that Act what I may call the civil side of manœuvres as opposed to the military side is placed in the hands of a Military Manœuvres Commission. That Commission consists of representatives of the local authorities in the district in which the manœuvres are held and of representatives nominated by the Secretary of State for War, but it is provided that the local representatives should be in a majority on the Commission. These Commissions have at various times made Reports to us, and it is upon those Reports that the present Bill is based. It seeks to carry out three important recommendations which these Commissions have made.

Clause 1 of the Bill seeks to modify the provision in the original Act which prevents our using the same locality more than once in five years. Under that Act we can only use a particular part of the country for manœuvres once in five years; that is to say, we can only proclaim that part of the country by Order in Council as a district for manœuvres once in five years. Once the Order in Council has been made proclaiming that district, although we have never held the manœuvres at all in that district, we are still debarred from using it again for five years. Last year we proclaimed the county of Essex, and had the manœuvres not been held last year the county of Essex could not have been used for another five years. We think it is not unreasonable to suggest that where we do not hold manœuvres in the district proclaimed, we should be allowed to proclaim it, if necessary, from year to year.

We also ask for a further amendment of this provision. Our experience shows us that manœuvres are not unpopular in the particular districts in which they are held, and we therefore ask that we should be allowed to hold manœuvres in a particular district more often than once in five years, provided the county council and the borough council concerned have no objection to our doing so. I think by that provision the rights of the public are amply safeguarded. Clause 1 also seeks to reduce from six to three months the period of notice we are bound to give to the local authorities. The Manœuvres Commission of 1898 recommended this change within a year of the passing of the Act. I think three months is plenty of notice for the local authorities; on the other hand, six months is rather long for us. We do not know till the Army Estimates are presented to Parliament, and even accepted, whether we shall be able to hold manœuvres at all, and if we do not know till March or April whether or not we shall be able to hold manœuvres, waiting six months forces us to wait till the end of the summer before we can carry them out.

I now come to Clause 2, which is obviously the most important clause in the Bill. The Act of 1897 mentions certain lands which we are not permitted to use. We are debarred by Clause 2 of the Act from entering any enclosed wood or plantation. One of the chief things, I may almost say the chief thing, which is instilled in the mind of the soldier at the present moment is the intelligent use of cover, and officers are continually instructing their men in formations particularly suited to the ground over which they are at the moment manœuvring. In company training in the early part of the year men are properly grounded in the intelligent use of cover, yet when we come at the end of the year to the manœuvres, the finishing touch to all their instruction, we have to order our men to avoid what is obviously the best, if not very nearly the only, cover available for them. The result is naturally a lack of reality in the work done, and, therefore, probably lack of interest.

Not only do we have local men as members of the Commission appointed by the local authorities, but we have been fortunate enough to secure the services of local men to represent the War Office, and these Commissions have spoken with no hesitating voice on the matter. The Commission of 1903 said—

"In this year's manœuvring area there was a considerable proportion of enclosed woods and plantations that were either not preserved at all, or only to a limited extent, and practically no damage would have been done, except to fences, by troops going through them. It would be beneficial if more elasticity could be given in this matter."

The Manœuvres Commission of last year went further. In their Report they said—

"The Commissioners think it is a matter of great importance that troops should be allowed to manœuvre through woods and plantations; and the provisions of the Manœuvres Act should be amended in this respect, subject, of course, to full compensation being granted for damage or loss sustained."

I venture to think, first of all, that the damage would not be great. We do not wish our troops to go through woods in the same way as a line of beaters would. All they need do is to march down the sides, and perhaps line the hedges at the end. But if we do any damage we are already under the old Act liable to pay the fullest compensation. I think your Lordships will admit that the system of paying compensation has worked properly, and caused satisfaction to those concerned. In their Report the Commission of 1903, said—

"The system adopted for the assessment of damage and payment of claims seems to have been satisfactory, for, while allowing for ample compensation, it would appear to have guarded against fraud and the payment of unreasonable claims."

If this provision is refused by your Lordships it means that while we are paying a considerable sum of money in certain years for carrying out manœuvres, which are admitted to be of the greatest importance, yet we have to absolutely neglect, as I venture to think, the most important thing that it is necessary to teach the troops. As a practice for actual warfare it cannot be denied that this is a most serious state of affairs.

The rights of property owners are still further safeguarded under the old Act. Under Clause 5 of that Act the Military Manœuvres Commission may make orders for determining what lands, roads, and sources of water are to be authorised lands, roads, and sources within the meaning of the Act, which amounts in working to this, that any landowner can object to land of any sort being used for the purpose of manœuvres. If he lodges his objection the Manœuvres Commission holds a sitting and hears his objection, and they are paramount in deciding whether or not that particular land shall be used for manœuvres. Therefore, I say, seeing that we pay full compensation and that an owner of land has absolute power of presenting his views to the Military Manœuvres Commission, and, if he has a reasonable objection, of getting his land not used for manœuvre purposes, I do not think your Lordships will be injuring anybody in giving us this general power to enter woods and plantations when manœuvres are in progress.

Clause 3 deals with the closing of roads. The old Act gave certain powers for closing roads; they were not exactly the powers we wanted, and they are not even the powers people think we have got. We were authorised to close roads, but we had to obtain leave to do so from petty sessions and give seven days notice. That is not what we require. What we require is to be able to close a road for, say, a couple of hours while a flank attack or something similar is being delivered, and petty sessions have been willing to give us general powers to close a road now and again for a couple of hours, provided, naturally, that we give proper facilities for traffic in some other direction. But high legal authority has been obtained to the effect that petty sessions have no right to give that general power, and therefore we now ask in this Bill that they shall be given power to authorise us to close roads for not more than a couple of hours at a time whilst giving reasonable facilities for traffic. That is practically the whole of the Bill which is now submitted to your Lordships. The Reports of the Military Manœuvres Commission have been very satisfactory to us. I am glad to say that they prove that the manœuvres have been very popular in the districts in which they have been carried out, and they also bear the strongest possible witness to the exemplary conduct of the troops whilst manœuvres have been going on. I therefore venture to think your Lordships will not be endangering the comfort of any individual in giving this Bill a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Lord MONKSWELL: My Lords, I entirely sympathise with the noble Earl and the objects he has in view. I think he has made out a very excellent case for his first amendment of the law, which is, that if a locality has no objection to manœuvres taking place more than once in five years, the War Office shall be at liberty to so hold them. I do not think there can be any question that that would be advantageous, but I have some little doubt about the six months notice, and for this reason. It appears to me that the period of six months was put in the Act of 1897 for the express purpose of giving the county council power of deciding whether or not they approved of the Draft Order before it was advertised in the local Press. Whilst six months notice must be given to the county council only three months notice need be given in the local newspapers. It was pointed out in the debates in the House of Commons that county councils sometimes do not meet more than once in three months; and the period of six months was inserted, no doubt, to make certain that every county council should have an opportunity of considering the Draft Order before it was advertised. It appears to me that there was some sense in that view, and I should like the noble Earl to consider it. The proposed alteration with regard to woods and plantations is an important one, and I should like to remind the House that the provision exempting enclosed woods and plantations was in the Bill of 1896, which did not pass the House of Commons because it was too stringent. This Bill is certainly very much less stringent in the powers it gives to the military, and it does seem rather going back to suggest that limitations of powers which were put into a Bill of 1896 should be taken out of this Bill in 1905. But I think the noble Earl has given fair reasons why we should at all events consider the proposal. With regard to the closing of roads, I think the noble Earl has made out a very good case for some change in the law, but he will observe that in his Bill it is within the power of a subaltern, of the youngest second-lieutenant, to give an order to close a road for a couple of hours. I am not at all sure that it ought to go down quite so low as that, and I am inclined to think that some slight modification of that power would be advisable. Subject to these observations, so far as I am concerned I welcome the Bill and support the Second Reading.

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I agree entirely with what has fallen from the noble Lord who has just sat down, but I do not think, in passing this Bill, we ought to lose sight of the fact that considerable sacrifice is going to be imposed on the inhabitants of these localities. It is right and proper that that sacrifice should be imposed, because if manœuvres are to be held the greatest facilities should be given to the troops for carrying them out. At the same time I do not think we should forget that we are imposing considerable sacrifices on the landowners and inhabitants of the localities where the manœuvres are to take place. With regard to the question of six months notice, it seems to me that the provision introduced in this Bill, that in future the Government will be able to propose that manœuvres should take place within five years in districts in which they have been announced but have not been carried out—it seems to me that that provision to a great extent removes the necessity for reducing the notice to three months, because, though you may give your six months notice that you are going to carry out manœuvres, you are in no way prevented from selecting that locality the next year if for any reason the manœuvres are not held. The War Office would be in a position six months beforehand to form an opinion that there would probably be manœuvres, and they might give notice six months in advance. If that notice was not followed up by action the War Office is not prevented from using that locality again, say, the following year.

Then with regard to the question of woods, I should like to express my full concurrence with what the noble Lord said as to the desirability of troops being allowed to use woods for manœuvres. I have myself seen the training of Regular troops carried out largely inside woods; the training has been very successful and has done a great deal of good. There is no doubt, however, that considerable damage will be done to the woods used. The noble Lord spoke in rather a light and airy way of the amount of damage that is going to be done. I think the risk of damage should be incurred, but the War Office must not try to hide from themselves that a considerable amount of damage will be done to those woods and plantations. I trust that the greatest possible care will be taken that the damage shall be as small as possible. The noble Earl said the troops would not manœuvre through woods as if they were a row of beaters. I am rather inclined to say, from what I have seen myself of that sort of work within woods, that it does amount very much to that. They proceed in open order very much as beaters do. There are many woods in which little harm would be done, but even the breaking down of fences will not be a small thing, and from time to time damage may be done to trees and underwood over and above that done to game. Therefore I hope that when the Bill gets into Committee this aspect of the question will not be lost sight of, and that the War Office will consider whether they cannot introduce some further safeguards to secure the interests of owners.

My noble friend, Lord Monkswell, seemed to entertain some fear with regard to the power given in the Bill for stopping up footways. The idea is simply that it may be necessary to stop for a couple of hours a footpath going through a wood, and I do not think it can be contended that that would be doing any great amount of harm. Still, I do think that any such closing should, if carried out under the orders of a commissioned officer of low rank, be with the concurrence of his own superior officer, or the captain of the company or squadron, or the field officer in charge. With these few suggestions I shall be very pleased to give my support to the Second Reading.

*LORD HYLTON: My Lords, I merely rise to suggest whether some modification should not be introduced in Clause 2 with regard to newly-planted woods and plantations. In a plantation that had only been planted two or three years before, any body of troops, however anxious not to do damage, would be bound to cause great damage. I therefore hope the noble Earl will see some way of modifying that clause. Even if compensation were given to the owner it would mean that two or three years would have been lost.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): I am glad to notice that the criticisms which have been offered on the Bill are of an entirely friendly character, and are in no way directed against its principles. It would be most unfair for want of proper precautions to expose the owners of valuable woods and plantations to the risk of having their property damaged. But under the present law military manœuvres, to which we all attach such importance, are deprived of a great part of their utility because the troops are denied the use of the only cover available to them. We have to bear in mind that under the existing law, as we propose to amend it by this Bill, these questions are relegated to the Manœuvres Commission, which is constituted with the express purpose of securing not only an adequate representation of local opinion but a preponderance of local opinion; and if there are any particular woods, such as new plantations, liable to damage, it will be easy for the proprietor to apply to the Manœuvres Commission to have them exempted from the area used by the troops. As to other woodlands, no doubt some damage may be done, but I cannot bring myself to believe that it will be of such a character as to be incapable of compensation by pecuniary means. As a resident in a county in which manœuvres have taken place for many years, I have never heard but one opinion of the excellence of the War Office as a paymaster. I have never heard that anybody has complained that where harm has been done of any kind compensation has not been forthcoming. I think, therefore, that, though we may have to consider these criticisms on the Committee stage, your Lordships may pass the Second Reading without any misgiving.

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

STREET BETTING BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I am sure the great majority of your Lordships, if not all, will approve of this Bill and of my noble and learned friend (Lord Davey's) efforts to frame a measure which will stay a great evil. My object in rising is to appeal to my noble and learned friend whether he cannot do something to strengthen the measure. My impression is that the Bill was stronger last year than it is now, and that it has been cut down and modified. I know last year the Bill met with the approval of my right rev. friend the Bishop of Hereford. As the Bill appears before us, after the ordeal of last year it brings a feeling of disappointment to those who have this reform at heart. The object of the Bill is to prevent betting in public places under circumstances that give great facility to the professional better, and, therefore, a great opportunity of leading astray persons who desire to bet. These people do not go into thoroughfares where traffic is great, but mostly frequent vacant pieces of ground that are unused until buildings can be put upon them, and also railway arches which afford them shelter, and where they can make appointments. They also frequent common ground in the neighbourhood of London, Bristol, and elsewhere. It is strange that in this Bill, as was pointed out last session, not one of these places is touched, and we are committing the great evil of telling persons whom we wish to suppress that it is legal for them to go to these places and bet. Therefore I am afraid that the balance from this Bill will be of evil results rather than good. Places which are forbidden are to be found in Clause 1—

> "Any person frequenting any street, public park, or garden," etc.

LORD DAVEY: The meaning of "street" is very large.

***LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD**: The definition of "street" is given in the Bill as follows—

> "For the purpose of this section the word 'street' shall include any highway, public bridge, road, lane, footway, square, court, alley, or passage, whether a thoroughfare or not."

I ask your Lordships whether this definition would include vacant ground or railway arches. It would not. So the result is—we are telling these gentlemen whose trade we wish to put an end to, "You can go to these convenient places and you will be saved from any kind of penalty." Let me appeal to my noble friend. This limitation was not in his original Bill. This is not a measure to prevent persons betting, but they must "frequent" certain places. It means that they must be there frequently, and, therefore, if the officers concerned see a man there betting it will be necessary for them to prove that he had been in the habit of going there frequently. What does all this come to? We have no definition of what "frequenting" means, and therefore I can only translate the word itself to mean that a person before conviction must have been frequently in one particular place. I know my noble and learned friend (Lord Davey) has got this good work at heart, and I am hoping that he will give us his aid and encouragement in making the Bill effective. If the Bill goes in its present shape to the other House it will not have any chance of passing, It is not good enough to make anybody anxious to pass it, but its defects will make many persons oppose it. I would therefore ask my noble and learned friend if he cannot do something to encourage us in attempting to improve this Bill.

LORD DAVEY: My Lords, I am glad to notice the great interest which my noble and learned friend opposite takes in the success of this Bill, and I am in entire sympathy with him in desiring to make the Bill as complete as it can be made for the purpose for which it is intended. And if my noble friend will either suggest to me, or will himself put down any Amendments in the Standing Committee with that object, I can assure him they will meet with no opposition from myself, and I shall be obliged to him for doing so. With regard to the criticisms which he has made I am sorry that my noble friend Lord Belper is not present in the House, because I believe the portions of the Bill to which my noble and learned friend (Lord James) directed his criticisms were Amendments which I accepted from the Government; and my noble and learned friend, I am sure, knows that any private Member in this House, particularly one on the benches on which I usually sit, has very little chance of passing such a Bill through the House unless he is willing to accept what the Government offer him. Therefore, the authorship of the words which my noble friend criticised lies, I think, with the Government draughtsman. I agree that "frequenting" is not the best word that could be used. I object myself to turning adjectives into verbs, and I do not think "frequenting" is a very elegant expression in the English language. I think the word "using" would be just as useful and would not be open to the criticism which the noble and learned Lord makes. But I will consider the matter and in the Standing Committee perhaps I shall be able to suggest some other word which will more aptly meet my noble and learned friend's criticisms.

Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee

---

RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at five minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 2nd March, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

HECKMONDWIKE IMPROVEMENT BILL.

"To confer upon the Urban District Council of Heckmondwike further powers with regard to the supply of water and electricity, and the improvement, health, local government, and finance of the district; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

WIGAN CORPORATION BILL.

"To consolidate and amend the provisions relating to the tramway undertaking of the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Wigan; and to confer further powers upon them in relation to that undertaking; to empower them to erect a town hall and public baths; to make provision for the establishment of a cattle mart; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time.

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do nominate a Committee, not exceeding eleven Members, to be called the Police and Sanitary Committee, to whom shall be committed all Private Bills promoted by municipal and other local authorities by which it is proposed to create powers relating to Police or Sanitary Regulations in conflict with, deviation from, or excess of the provisions of the general law.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 150 and 173A apply to all such Bills.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That four be the quorum of the Committee.

Ordered, That if the Committee shall report to the Committee of Selection that any clauses of any Bill referred to them (other than clauses containing police and sanitary regulations) are such as, having regard to the terms of reference, it is not in their opinion necessary or advisable for them to deal with, the Committee of Selection shall thereupon refer the Bill to a Select Committee who shall consider those clauses and so much of the Preamble of the Bill as relates thereto, and shall determine the expenditure (if any) to be authorised in respect of the parts of the Bill referred to them. That the Committee shall deal with the remaining clauses of such Bill, and so much of the Preamble as relates thereto, and shall determine the period and mode of repayment of any money authorised by the Select Committee to be borrowed, and shall report the whole Bill to the House, stating in their Report what parts of the Bill have been considered by each Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power, if they so determine, to sit as two Committees, and in that event to apportion the Bills referred to the Committee between the two Committees, each of which shall have the full powers of, and be subject to the instructions which apply to, the undivided Committee, and that three be the quorum of each of the two Committees.—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

RATHMINES AND RATHGAR EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT BILL.

Petition for additional provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

SELECTION (PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899) (COMMISSIONERS).

MR. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection; That, in pursuance of the provisions of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, they had discharged Mr. Charles Hobhouse, and had selected Mr. Black, to act as Commissioner.

Report to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 27th February, 1905, declaring that Certificates for Sea-going Passenger Steamers granted in Mauritius shall be of the same force as if granted in the United Kingdom, and that Part III. of the Act shall apply with modifications to such Certificates [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Middlesex, dividing the Parish of Acton, in the Ealing Parliamentary Division, into two Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BARBADOS.

Copy presented, of Special Rules for Juvenile Adult Prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BANKRUPTCY COURTS (IRELAND).

Annual Returns presented, of the Official Assignees of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland and the Local Courts, Belfast and Cork, for the year 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No, 3326 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Suggested Coastguard Station at Sanday, Orkney.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Lord-Advocate if the Secretary for Scotland will cause inquiry to be made as to the number of wrecks and lives lost during this last winter round the North Isles, Orkney, and the desirability of establishing a coastguard station at Sanday, equipped with a rocket life-saving apparatus.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have inquired into this question, and find that two vessels stranded on the island of Sanday this winter, and about sixteen lives were lost. It is doubtful whether a rocket apparatus would have been of any service in these cases, but I will make further inquiries, and inform the hon. Member of the result.

Inquiry into Depression of Fishing Industry in Sutherland and Caithness.

Mr. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Lord-Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, if he can state when the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Depression of the Fishing Industry in Sutherland and Caithness will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) I am not able to give the exact date when the Report in question will be issued, but the Secretary for Scotland has been in communication with the chairman, and there will be no avoidable delay.

Delivery of London Night Mails in the North of Scotland.

Mr. HARMSWORTH: To ask the Postmaster-General if he is now in a position to state whether any new arrangements have been made with the West Coast Railways with the object of ensuring that the down night mails from London to the North of Scotland will be delivered at schedule times.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am glad to say that, as the result of measures taken both by the railway companies and by the Post Office, a considerable improvement has been effected in the working of the night mail service from London to the North of Scotland. There have, during the past few months, been very few cases of material delay not attributable to some unavoidable cause such as unfavourable weather or an accident on the railway.

Relatives of Supervising Officers in Post Office.

Mr. GODDARD (Ipswich): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the rule providing that relatives of supervising officers should not be appointed at the same offices applies to all postal and telegraph offices; whether he will state the reasons for the exemption of any towns from the enforcement of the rule; and whether he will state what steps are taken to prevent nepotism at these places.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) At smaller post offices the rule generally is that male relatives of supervising officers are to be admitted only on condition of transfer to other offices at the age of nineteen, and female relatives on condition only of transfer if the relationship should at any time be considered detrimental to the efficiency of the service. At larger offices at which open competition is in force the condition on appointment for males and females alike is liability to transfer if the relationship should at any time be considered detrimental. I do not consider that there is any reason for modifying these rules.

Interruption of the Telegraph Service with Shetland.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: To ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that Shetland was deprived of telegraphic communication with the outside world for a period of three weeks, suffering inconvenience thereby, and if the persons responsible for the delay in repairing the cable will be called to account; and whether an offer was made to the Post Office to repair the cable in twenty-four hours; and, if so, why such offer was not accepted.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am aware that telegraphic communication with Shetland has been interrupted, but there has been no avoidable delay in restoring it. When the break occurred the telegraph ship "Monarch" was on her way to the Thames; after refitting she took in cable and sailed for the North on February 18th. Attempts to establish communication in the meantime by special electrical means through the broken cable had failed. The "Monarch" has encountered very stormy weather, and has therefore been unable to do any work. No offer to repair the cable has reached me. I am sorry for the inconvenience which has arisen; and I have endeavoured to minimise it by providing a special boat service for telegrams.

Belfast Post Office Staff.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that twenty-five young men, ranging from eighteen years of age to twenty years, are employed to the indoor staffs at the Belfast office at a wage of 6s. per week; does he propose to give these young men any consideration; and, if so, when.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the position of the ten female learners who are attached to the telegraph staff of the Belfast office with a wage of 5s. per week; and whether, in view of the fact that vacancies are not now being filled up owing to a reduction of the female staff having been authorised, he will consider the advisability of increasing the salaries of these learners.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The pay of the male and female learners at Belfast, to which the hon. Member refers in his two Questions, will be considered in connection with the case of the learners generally throughout the United Kingdom with which I am now dealing.

Members of Parliament and Civil Servants.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Treasury Minute issued in 1866, which stated that the Treasury offered no obstacle to the most free action on the part of Members of the Legislature who, on public grounds, may consider it their duty, whether in Parliament or communications to the Treasury, to call attention to the grievances of individuals, or desire to enter upon questions affecting the conditions of service of public officers is applicable to-day; whether public servants are liable to punishment from their superior officers in the event of their individual grievances being laid before the heads of their Departments by Members of Parliament; and whether he will consider the advisability of re-issuing the Minute of 1866.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The Minute, from which the hon. Member quotes, goes on to observe that "there is much inconvenience in and serious objection to the reception of applications coming from any of His Majesty's Civil Servants on matters affecting their personal interests or position, except through the head of the Department to which they belong;" calls attention to the "very stringent rules which have long prevailed in the Revenue Departments against the solicitation of promotion by influential persons unconnected with the service," and states that "the same objections apply in principle to applications for increases of salary on reclassification of offices, and the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury desire that it may be understood that henceforth, as a general rule, no application in relation to increased pay or allowances (or for promotion where such rests with the Treasury) will be entertained by them unless transmitted through the head of the Department to which the applicant belongs." In a second Minute, dated 2nd May of the following year, the Treasury recurred to the subject, remarking that "my Lords have observed with much regret a growing practice on the part of gentlemen employed in the public service to endeavour to influence this Board to accede to their applications for increase of salary or additional retiring allowance by means of the private solicitations of Members of Parliament and other persons of political influence." The Minute concludes by stating that "any attempt made by him to obtain the sanction of this Board to his application by any such solicitation as is hereinbefore referred to, will be treated by them as an admission on the part of such officer that his case is not good upon its merits, and such application will be dealt with by their Lordships accordingly." Both these Minutes are still in force, but I see no reason for re-issuing them. The answer to the second Question would depend upon the particular circumstances of the case.

Old Age Pensions—Mr. Cottew's Scheme.

Mr. JOSEPH HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the scheme of old age pensions submitted to the Government in 1895 by the originator, Mr. W. S. Cottew, involving no expense to the country, has been brought to his notice; and whether he can now take it into consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I have had the scheme referred to by my hon. friend under my notice, but I am not impressed by its feasibility.

Navy—Age Retirement Rules.

Mr. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether there is any intention to reduce the age of compulsory retirement for commissioned or warrant officers of any branches of the service.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The Admiralty is not aware of any such intention.

Identification of Law-breaking Motorists.

Mr. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of the Lord Chief Justice, in trying the case Rex *v.* Noble at Reading on February 4th, that there should be some better means of identifying law-breaking motorists; and, if so, will he say whether he proposes to introduce legislation with that object.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have seen no report of the observations of the Lord Chief Justice in the case referred to beyond a short newspaper paragraph. I am not aware of any better method of identifying law-breaking motorists than that at present in force.

Hours of Railway Servants.

Mr. BELL (Derby): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has observed in the Return of hours worked by certain classes of railway men, recently issued, the number of instances of long hours of duty; and, if so, will he say what steps has he taken, or proposes to take, with the railway companies with a view to reducing the hours to a reasonable limit; and will he ask for a Return for January last upon the same lines.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The recent Return has been carefully examined by the Board of Trade, and I have caused a communication to be addressed to each of the railway companies the hours of whose servants would appear from the Return to have been on some occasion or occasions unreasonably long. I am considering the question of calling for a further similar Return, but am not at present prepared to make a definite statement in the matter.

Places Available for Successful King's Scholars.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he can state how many young men and women respectively have qualified for admission to a training college by passing in the first or second class at the recent King's Scholarship examination, the final examination for pupil teachers in the public elementary schools; how many residential and day college places are available for these successful King's scholars, men and women respectively; and how the places available in the residential colleges are distributed in Church of England, Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, and undenominational institutions respectively.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) At the King's Scholarship Examination held in December last, 1,506 men and 4,245 women qualified for admission to a training college. So far as the Board's information goes at present, the number of vacant places available for students desirous of entering a training college in October next will be at least 4,800. It must be remembered that some of these places will be filled by students who have qualified for admission by some means other than that of passing the King's Scholarship Examination. The details as to the vacant places are roughly as follows:—

Residential Colleges.

Denomination.	Men.	Women.	Total.
Church of England - - - - - -	644	1,253	1,897
Wesleyan - - - - - - -	78	68	146
Roman Catholic - - - - - -	34	187	221
Undenominational - - - - - -	105	433	538
Total - - -	861	1,941	2,802

Day Colleges.

All Undenominational.	Men - - - -	(about)	800
	Women - - - -	(about)	1,200
	Total - -	(about)	2,000

Indian Budget.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will arrange to bring forward the Budget Statement at an earlier period of the session than on former occasions; and can he see his way to arrange for details of accounts to be quoted in pounds sterling as well as in rupees.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am not at present able to give information as to the date in the present session on which the usual Resolution concerning the revenue and expenditure of India will be moved. It has been the practice for some years to present to the House statements showing in sterling all the important figures in the Indian Accounts and Estimates. The Secretary of State's Explanatory Memorandum and the Return of Net Income and Expenditure for eleven years are prepared in sterling. In the tables accompanying the Financial Statement, which is prepared in India, the practice is (as the hon. Member will observe on referring to pages 83–99 of last year's Statement) to show some figures in sterling only and some in rupees and sterling. As this Statement and the accompanying tables are primarily prepared to be considered and discussed in the Governor-General's Council in India it would be inconvenient to make any considerable alteration in its form, but I will ask the Government of India whether they can without inconvenience arrange to give, in the body of the Statement, the sterling equivalent of some of the figures which are now quoted there in rupees only.

Indian Budget—Causes of Increased Expenditure.

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the chief causes of the Indian Government's increased expenditure, during the first eight months of the financial year, under the head of Military Services, of 100 lakhs in excess of the Budget Estimates; have there been any recent savings under that head, or is that excess likely to be increased during the remaining portion of the year ending with next month; to what unforeseen circumstances is attributable the excess in those eight months under the head of Civil Debts; to what amount, beyond the Budget Estimate of £18,435,500 for the Home Charges, have the Secretary of State's drawings on India reached at the present date, and to what purposes are these excess drawings being applied; and what is the present amount of the Indian Government's cash balances in this country and in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I gather that the hon. Member's Question is based on the account published in the *Gazette* of India of January 28th, but the excess of 100 lakhs (approximately) shown in this account in the military expenditure in the first eight months of 1904–5 is an excess over the expenditure for the corresponding period of 1903–4, not over the Budget Estimate for 1904–5. A comparison between the estimated and actual military expenditure in 1904–5 will be given, as usual, with explanations in the Financial Statement of the Government of India, which will be made in the course of the present month. I anticipate that the expenditure on Army Services in 1904–5 will exceed the Budget Estimate by more than 100 lakhs, the excess being chiefly due to the greater cost of the Tibet Mission and to outlay which it has been decided to incur in connection with the reorganisation and improvement of the Indian Army. The account to which I have referred shows an increase of 100 lakhs in 1904–5 in permanent debt incurred in India; this increase is over 1903–4, and is explained by the fact that a rupee loan of three crores was issued in 1904–5, whereas the loan of 1903–4 was for only two crores. The drawings on India amounted to £21,150,000 on February 28th. The excess over the amount required to meet the Home Charges (*i.e.*, the payments in this country charged against revenue) is devoted to defraying capital expenditure on railways and irrigation works and to replenishing the balances of the Secretary of State in Council. The balances of the Government of India on January 31st, 1905, amounted to £8,360,000, and those of the Secretary of State in Council on February 28th to £10,484,000.

Proceedings of Urban Councils.

Mr. P. J. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is no provision prescribed for summoning a special meeting of an urban council to transact the business of the quarterly meeting when the first fixture of same falls through for want of a quorum; and whether the Local Government Board for Ireland will take steps to apply to the proceedings of urban councils the provisions of Article 12 (3) and Article 16 (4) of The Local Government (Procedure of Councils) Order, 1901.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Local Government Board is not aware that inconvenience has been caused by the absence of such provision from the urban district councils' general rules; but, as the question of revising these rules is at present under consideration, the matter will receive attention.

Recently Appointed Resident Magistrates—Previous Occupation, etc.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the names, ages, previous occupations, and religion of the last five appointments to the position of resident magistrate in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*)

Name.	Previous Occupation.	Age when appointed.	Date of Appointment.
Byrne, J. P. - -	Constabulary Officer for 20 years	43 years	1st May, 1903
White, J. T. - -	Barrister-at-Law	34 "	"
Gosselin, B. - -	Captain, Royal Artillery	32 "	"
Wynne, E. M. P. -	Constabulary Officer for 20 years	44 "	"
Johnstone, W. E. -	In Army	40 "	16th January, 1904

Two of these gentlemen are Catholics and three Protestants.

Teachers' Pensions.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will consider the advisability of granting full pensions to male teachers upon the completion of thirty-five years service, and thirty years for females, and in case of disablements after ten years service.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The pensions under existing regulations are as high as is consistent with the solvency of the pension fund, and I cannot undertake, as at present advised, to alter them.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Flogging in the Navy.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that in October last a boy named George Lillie, of the cruiser list, was sentenced by a Court-martial, held on board H.M.S. "Victory," to three months imprisonment and to receive twenty-four stripes with the birch for rushing, during the caning of another boy which he was compelled to witness, at the officer who was superintending the punishment and striking him; and whether, having regard to the fact that the presence of all the boys on board ship to witness the birchings and canings of their comrades is calculated to engender feelings of resentment and to lead to acts of insubordination, steps will be taken for the rescission of the provision in the King's Naval Regulations for the presence of all the boys to witness such punishments.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The facts are as stated. There is no intention of making any alteration in the regulations.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: On the first opportunity I will give the hon. Gentleman a rhetorical flogging on this subject.

The "Enchantress."

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the total cost of the Admiralty yacht "Enchantress"; has the last instalment of that cost been paid, and has the yacht been taken over; what is the total annual cost of the crew and the keeping up of the Admiralty yacht; how many days has this yacht been used by the Lords of the Admiralty during each of the past three years respectively; and is there any reason why the Lords of the Admiralty should not use a cruiser for their official voyages.

Mr. PRETYMAN: The total cost of the "Enchantress" is £126,393. The last instalment has not been paid. The yacht has been taken over. The total annual cost of the crew and the keeping up, exclusive of coal and sea stores, is approximately £17,600. The cost of these stores would probably not exceed, on an average, £4,000 per annum. The yacht has only been available for use for the past nine months. The objections to the use of a cruiser for this purpose are—(1) the interference with the scheme of fleet organisation and general service; (2) the unsuitability of cruiser accommodation for the purpose.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that cruisers are constantly used for taking Ministers about?

[No Answer was returned.]

Cape Government Customs Duties—Rebate Claim.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if a settlement has been arrived at with the Cape Government in respect of the counterclaim for £170,000 for rebate of Customs duties paid upon articles purchased during the war; how much has been recovered; and how has the amount been dealt with.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): No settlement has yet been arrived at.

Mr. WHITLEY: Is there any hope of an early settlement?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I must ask for notice of that Question.

New Guns for the Artillery.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of new guns for which orders have been given, and where these orders have been placed.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: One hundred and ninety-four new 13-pounder guns and 878 new 18-pounder guns have been ordered, and the orders have been placed as follows:—Ordnance factories, 352; Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co., 288; Vickers, Maxim, and Co., 288; Cammell and Co., 144—total, 1,072.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL. How many of these firms are Birmingham firms?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: None.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Oh, what a pity!

Payment for the New Guns.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether the guns ordered by the War Office on March 5th, 1904, are to be paid for on the Army Estimates; and, if not, how is the payment to be made.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The date upon which the orders for the guns were given was May 5th, 1904, when orders were placed with the Ordnance Factories for twenty 13-pounder guns for India. For these guns the Indian Government will pay.

The New Rifle.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it was in the knowledge of the Army Council that the Small Arms Factory considered the specifications they were ordered to work on in making the new short rifle most unsatisfactory, and that in consequence the rifle would be no improvement on that now in use.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Answer is in the negative.

Army Uniform Changes.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War why the regulation sash has been changed in colour and texture; and whether he can explain in the cavalry mess kit in frock coats (new parts), puttees, the pattern legging for mounted units, the badges of rank, the great coat, and the cavalry and infantry sword, the object of the constant changes that have taken place more or less recently. The hon. Member explained that the Question had been rather mixed in the printing, but perhaps the right hon. Gentleman could answer it.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I will try. The numerous details involved in a reply to the hon. Member's Question cannot be conveniently given in the form of an answer in the House, but I shall be happy to supply him with particulars upon any specific points in connection with the changes in uniforms which have taken place. Generally these changes have been made with a view to economy and the increased efficiency of the service.

British Officers in Japan.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the War Office lately invited applications from officers for two years residence and military study in Japan, with certain emoluments and privileges, he will state how many officers applied from each branch, Engineer, Artillery, Cavalry, and Infantry; whether, seeing that three Infantry and one Artillery officer were selected, he will state who are the persons who made this selection, and on what grounds did they prefer three Infantry officers to all the Engineer officers and all but one of the Artillery officers who applied; whether any further similar appointments are to be made; and, if so, will he direct the selection board to consider the claims of the scientific branches of the service.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The number of officers who applied was as follows:—Engineers 15, Artillery 46, Cavalry 11, Infantry 84, Army Service Corps 9, and Royal Army Medical Corps 1. Of these all who had not passed for promotion were excluded, leaving: Engineers 2, Artillery 15, Cavalry 3, Infantry 29, and Army Service Corps 4. The selection was made finally by the

Chief of the General Staff. Four selections are made annually. There were already four Artillery and three Engineer officers in Japan as compared with three Infantry and two Cavalry officers; in these circumstances the selection of three Infantry officers and one Artillery officer was considered a proper proportion.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): Are these appointments open to officers of the Indian Army?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: A certain proportion of officers have been appointed from India, but I am speaking only of those appointed from here.

Staff College Appointments.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that twenty places in the Staff College are open to Army officers in each year, which, as the result of an examination, are awarded as follows, two to the Royal Engineers, four to the Artillery, and fourteen to the Cavalry and Infantry, and seeing that it constantly happens that as the result of the examination a number of Engineer and Artillery officers who are unsuccessful come out higher in the examination than many of the Infantry and Cavalry candidates who are successful, whether he will explain why this system is adopted of selecting for the most important and responsible positions officers who have by examination distinctly proved their inferiority.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The proficiency in mathematics which Artillery and Engineer officers are obliged to attain before entering the Army gives them a special advantage in that subject, while in the military subjects Cavalry and Infantry officers more than hold their own. In these circumstances it is considered that mathematics should not be allowed to turn the scale against Cavalry and Infantry, and it is held to be fair and in the interests of the service to allot a certain proportion of nominations to each arm of the service. I must also point out that Staff appointments are allotted according to order of merit in passing out of the college, a test in which Cavalry and Infantry officers well hold their own with those of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers.

Cost of Somaliland Operations.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the total cost of the Somaliland operations from January 1st, 1900, and inclusive of the Supplementary Vote now presented.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The total cost of the Somaliland operations amounts to £2,494,000.

MR. WHITLEY: Does that cover the period from the year 1900, or does it only refer to the third attempt to catch the Mad Mullah?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May I ask whether the total as shown by the Vote presented to the House to-day is not £3,200,000?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Perhaps the hon. Member will give me notice of that.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May it not be that no account has been taken of appropriations-in-aid?

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): Does it include merely the expenditure on Army Votes or on Civil Service Votes as well?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: All.

Army Hay Contract.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War by whose authority the amount of 30s. a ton was paid to a contractor as compensation for non-delivery of 3,800 tons of hay and 6s. 10½d. a quarter for non-delivery of oats, as reported by the Public Accounts Committee; and has any action been taken in the matter.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It was not possible at the time to place full details before the Committee. The payments in question were made by the authority of the Secretary of State for War. It is not in the power of the War Office to fix the prices which contractors will accept under such circumstances; but the arrangements made were far more favourable than adhesion to the contract, and I think they were reasonable, as the contractors had, in addition to loss on sales, to be reimbursed for expenses which they had incurred for chartering ships sent.

Ibadan.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has received any remonstrances or complaints from individuals or associations regarding the terms on which 5,000 acres are held of the natives near Ibadan; if he is aware that the natives object to parting with their land; and if he will cause the fullest inquiry to be made before bringing any pressure to bear on the native chiefs to compel them to part with their land.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): No such complaint or remonstrance has been addressed to me, and I should not countenance any such pressure as the hon. Member refers to being put upon the native chiefs.

Transvaal Labour Regulations.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to a proclamation issued in the *Transvaal Government Gazette* of January 27th, to the effect that every employer of labour on the Rand must give prompt information by telephone or messenger to the Foreign Labour Department in case of any outbreak or disturbance amongst the labourers in his employ, and to the effect that any employer failing to do so shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £50, or, in default, to imprisonment for three months; whether he has any information respecting the necessity for this proclamation; and, if not, whether he will communicate with Lord Milner on the matter.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have seen the Government notice containing the regulation referred to. Lord Milner has not specially reported to me the reasons for issuing the regulation, no doubt because it simply embodies a provision naturally arising out of the administration of the Labour Ordinance.

Transvaal Labour Statistics.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the total adult white male population in the Rand district according to the last census, and the total number of indentured Chinese coolies now in the same area; and also the total number of Chinese coolies which it is contemplated will be in the Rand by the close of June.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The Census Returns received up to date do not show the white adult male population on the Rand. The total white male population was 73,434. The number of Chinese at the end of January was 27,222. I believe the number now on the Rand is about 33,000. I am informed that at the end of January the total number for which the labour importation agency had received application was 54,862 (including those already introduced).

Canadian Garrisons.

Mr. REA (Gloucester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table the correspondence which passed between His Majesty's Government and the Government of the Dominion of Canada with reference to the assumption of the cost and responsibility of garrisoning Halifax and Esquimalt by the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. LYTTELTON: Correspondence on the subject will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it is complete.

Natal Church Council.

*Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to the Answer which he gave to a Question put by the hon. Member for Westminster, on August 10th,† 1904, what reply His Majesty has since then been advised to vouchsafe to the humble petition of the Church Council of the Diocese of Natal; and whether Papers on this subject will be presented to Parliament.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxl., 16.

MR. LYTTELTON: I did not find myself able to advise His Majesty to give any direction with regard to the petition, and the petitioners have been answered accordingly. It is not proposed to present Papers on the subject to Parliament.

*MR. CHANNING: Will the right hon. Gentleman reconsider more fully the whole circumstances with a view to secure to the Church of Natal its statutory rights as a branch of the Established Church of the United Kingdom?

MR. LYTTELTON: No, Sir.

*MR. CHANNING gave notice that he would draw attention to the matter on the earliest occasion.

Telegraphists' Grievances.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received a petition from the Committee of the London branch of the Telegraph Clerks' Association dealing with the claim that all operators should rise to a salary of £190 per annum, by reason of certain papers issued by the Civil Service Commissioners holding out this prospect; and whether, seeing that the Bradford Committee stated that these announcements on the part of the Commissioners were liable to misconception, he can state what compensation he is prepared to give to telegraphists who entered the service as a result of the inducements held out, and which have remained unfulfilled.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I have received the petition to which the hon. Member refers, and I have informed the memorialists that I can find no justication for an increase in the maximum pay for telegraphists in the Central Telegraph Office. The hon. Member appears to have overlooked the paragraph in the Report of the Bradford Committee immediately preceding that from which he quotes. In it the Committee state that they are convinced that there is no good ground for the allegation of breach of faith, and that they are satisfied that there is the same prospect now of attaining a salary of £190 a year as there was during the period when the announcements in question were made.

Emigration—Poor Law Guardians' Power to Assist.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, seeing that under the Act 12 and 13 Vic., c. 103, s. 20, guardians were empowered, with the consent of the Local Government Board, to spend one-half the average yearly poor rate raised in the parish in emigrating destitute persons at a cost not exceeding £10 per head, he will say whether these powers have ever been repealed; and, if not, whether he will call the attention of Metropolitan boards of guardians to the Act, and recommend them to work in conjunction with the Central Unemployed Committee in selecting destitute applicants who desire to be emigrated.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The section referred to has not been repealed, though the effect of subsequent enactments has been to modify its provisions. A board of guardians may, however, assist in emigrating poor persons belonging to the union, and I am now considering the question of recommending the making of arrangements between the Metropolitan boards of guardians and the Central Committee with a view to aiding emigration in suitable cases.

Abstractor Clerks.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the memorial from the assistant clerks, known as abstractor clerks, has been considered by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury; and, if so, whether he is prepared to say if any improvement is to be made in their *status* and positions.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The memorial to which the hon. Member refers is still under the consideration of the Treasury.

MR. NANNETTI: And when may an answer be expected?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I hope very shortly.

Duty-paid Foreign Spirits.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will give a Return showing the quantity of duty-paid brandy, rum, geneva, medicated spirits, and other foreign spirits, removed from one part of the United Kingdom to another, similar to the Table 27 for Home-made Spirits on page 36 of the last published Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: If the hon. Member will put down an unstarred Question I shall be happy to print an Answer showing the total quantities of duty-paid foreign spirits removed from one part of the United Kingdom to another in 1903–4. But it is not possible to distinguish between the different kinds of spirits named in the Question.

MR. KILBRIDE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state, with reference to Table 27 on page 36 of the last published Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, whether any Government officer ever checks, or is instructed to check, the bulk, quantity, or strength of the duty-paid spirits removed, accompanied by spirit certificates, from the stocks of spirit dealers; whether such certificates are usually filled in by lads employed by spirit dealers; and whether it is the custom of the spirit trade to give, on the face of such certificate, a strength greater by from 10 to 20 per cent. than is actually the case; and, if so, whether this table is taken into account in arriving at Ireland's contribution to the Imperial Revenue in Parliamentary Paper, No. 225.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The answer to the hon. Member's first Question is in the negative; the Inland Revenue officials check or test only those statements which affect payment or rate of duty. Inaccuracy in the particulars named in this part of the Question would not affect the Revenue, and the certificates of traders are therefore accepted without further test. As regards the second point, the Inland Revenue have no information which would tend to confirm the hon. Member's suggestions. The person who gives an inaccurate certificate renders himself liable to a fine of £100 and the forfeiture of the spirits; and, as such action would be a fraud upon the customer, the latter, I think, may be trusted to deal with the matter himself. To the third part of the Question, the answer is that the table is used in the preparation of the Return.

The Mall Improvements.

*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he can explain why the pillars, now in course of erection on either side of the approaches to the Mall and Birdcage Walk from Buckingham Gate, are being built at an angle to instead of square with the roadways and footways.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): These pillars are part of an architectural design forming a segment of a circle, as is clearly seen in approaching from Buckingham Palace Road. This accounts for their not standing squarely with the roads.

Heavy Motor Traffic in Scotland.

MR CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if, before bringing into operation in Scotland the Orders by which motor-cars with their loads weighing up to twelve tons are permitted to be driven on public highways in England at a speed of twelve miles an hour, he will take steps to ascertain the opinion thereon of the local authorities.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): The hon. Member may not be aware that the Heavy Motor Car (Scotland) Order, 1905, is already in force, having taken effect yesterday. The Secretary for Scotland consulted various authorities before issuing the Order, and gave consider tion to their views.

Illegal Trawling in Scottish Waters.

CAPTAIN ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether he will lay upon the Table the Correspondence which took place last year between the Foreign Office and His Majesty's representative at Christiania on the subject of illegal trawling in Scottish waters by trawlers registered in Norway?

MR SCOTT DICKSON: Before giving a definite Answer to the hon. Member's Question it will be necessary to consult with the Foreign Office on this subject. I shall communicate with the hon. Member on the subject.

Viceregal Poor Law Reform Commission.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Viceregal Poor Law Reform Commission appointed in 1903 has completed the taking of evidence; and, if so, when it may be expected to present its Report.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.—for Mr. WYNDHAM): The Commissioners hope to complete their inquiries early next month. It is not possible at present to state, even approximately, when their Report will be issued.

Pirie-Iveagh Motor Scheme.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the present position of the Pirie-Iveagh motor scheme.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The County Councils of Mayo and Galway, while approving of the experimental services proposed under the scheme in these counties, have not agreed to incur the expenditure necessary for putting the roads into a proper condition for motor traffic. In the County Antrim, the Midland Railway Company has taken up one of the services, and has, I believe, another service under consideration.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Is that all the progress that has been made with this scheme, which was announced two years ago?

MR. ATKINSON: According to the information in my possession it is.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Only two county councils have approved! What about the other county councils?

MR. ATKINSON: I have no further information.

MR. MACVEAGH: Were hopes held out to the promoters of the scheme that public money would be forthcoming for the repair of the roads?

MR. ATKINSON: I know nothing of that.

Local Government Orders—Downpatrick Protest.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received the unanimous resolution of the Downpatrick Union protesting against the adoption of the Public Bodies Order, 1904, and The Union Accounts Order, 1904; whether, in view of the protest of all the local authorities in Ireland, he proposes to suspend these Orders; and whether it is intended to give effect to the request of the Downpatrick Union for the issue of a volume containing the Rules and Orders issued prior to and since the passing of The Local Government Act, 1898?

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): The resolution has been received. The rural district council and the guardians were invited by the Board to indicate the provisions of the new Orders to which exception was taken and which would lead to the consequences suggested in the resolution, but, so far, they have failed to comply with the Board's request. My right hon. friend has already stated that the Orders are essential to a proper system of financial administration. With respect to the second part of the Question, I would refer to Parliamentary Papers, No. 360 of 1899; No. 359 and 360 of 1900; and No. 363 of 1904.

MR. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that no public board in Ireland and nobody else can make head or tail of these Orders? Will he consider the propriety of issuing them in a form more easily understood? There are about 600 of them.

Mr. ATKINSON was understood to reply that they were clear.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Has any public body approved them?

Mr. ATKINSON: Yes, Sir.

O'Brien Estate, County Longford.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain the cause of delay in the matter of the sale of the O'Brien Estate at Comakelly and Corglass, county Longford; whether he is aware that terms of purchase were agreed on by the tenants' and landlord's representatives in Longford in October last, and that when in January last a tenant named Francis M'Cabe tried to have a fair rent fixed by Judge Curran the case was struck out on the ground that the estate had been sold; and can he state when this matter is likely to be closed.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): It has not been found possible to obtain the information necessary to enable me to give a reply to this Question to-day and I must ask the hon. Member to postpone it until Monday next.

Irish Dispensary Districts—Ardee Inquiry.

Mr. NOLAN (Louth, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that an inquiry has been presently held in Ardee into a proposal on the part of the Local Government Board, Ireland, to convert the three existing dispensary districts of Collon, Drumcondra, and Dunleer into two, at an extra cost to the ratepayers, that the balance of evidence at the inquiry was against the proposal, and that the proposal, if carried into effect, would leave some of the people likely to require advice a distance of fourteen miles from the residence of the medical officer, he can state what is the final decision arrived at by the Local Government Board in regard to the matter.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): The inquiry referred to was held in January of last year. In September the Local Government Board made an Order under Seal rearranging the dispensary districts. Application was then made to the King's Bench Division for a Writ of certiorari to quash the Board's Order, and was refused with costs. An appeal to the Court of Appeal was dismissed on the 2nd ultimo. The Board's Order is now being put into operation, and the Board has also regulated the salaries of the two existing medical officers, allowing to them the amounts formerly paid to three officers. No extra cost to the ratepayers is entailed.

Mr. NOLAN: In consideration of these matters was regard had to the fact that the medical officer has to travel a distance of fourteen miles?

Mr. ATKINSON: Every fact was considered by the Local Government Board. They did not agree with the accuracy of the representations made.

Kerry County Council Audit.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the action of the Local Government Board taken on the report of their auditor, Mr. Browne, in drawing the attention of the Valuation Office to the present position in connection with the Limerick and Kerry Railway, has resulted in a loss of £486 12s. 4d. of the amount payable to the County Council of Kerry out of the Local Taxation (Ireland) Act, he will take any steps to prevent such loss, having regard to the fact that the Under-Secretary, on January 16th last, No. 637, wrote to the council that the apportionment of the proceeds of the purchase of the Limerick and Kerry Railway was duly and legally made.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): It is impossible in an Answer to the hon. Gentleman across the floor of the House to explain in an intelligible manner the difficult questions of law involved in this matter, and their bearing upon the facts, but if he will be good enough to put down an unstarred Question for Monday I shall be happy to give a reply dealing with the whole matter.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Was it the duty of this boy auditor to give information to the Valuation Office?

Mr. ATKINSON: He did nothing of the kind.

Constable M'Garry, of Belfast.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what were the charges preferred against Constable M'Garry, of Musgrave Street Barracks, Belfast; on what date were the charges made against him; on what date was he sent to a lunatic asylum; and what was the date he was told that he had been pensioned off; what was the date of his discharge from the asylum, and what was the nature of M'Garry's discharge from the force.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): I am making further inquiry into the facts in this case. Perhaps my hon. friend will postpone the Question until Monday next.

Wicklow Protests against Local Government Board Orders.

Mr. COGAN (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Wicklow County Council, the Wicklow Urban Council, the Bray Urban Council, and the Rathdrum Rural District Council passed resolutions disapproving of the Public Bodies Order, 1904, and alleging that many of the provisions of the Order are in excess of the powers conferred by statute upon the Local Government Board and lead to unnecessary complication and expense, and asking to have the Orders withdrawn or suitably modified so as to avoid friction and unnecessary expenditure; and, if so, whether, under these circumstances, he will have the Order withdrawn.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): The resolution has been received. The Local Government Board has been advised that all the provisions of the Order are *intra vires*. With regard to the remainder of the Question, I refer to the replies given by my right hon. friend, on the 16th † and 22nd ‡ February, to the similar inquiries addressed to him by the hon. Members for West Wicklow and North Kilkenny. It is not proposed to withdraw the Order.

Mr. COGAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the county councils of Ireland have refused to obey these Orders? What action do the Local Government Board intend to take on the matter?

Mr. ATKINSON: I am not aware of it. The remainder of the Question is hypothetical.

Lord Crofton's Estate, County Roscommon.

Mr. JAMES O'KELLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in connection with the sale of Lord Crofton's estate in the county of Roscommon, a grazing farm of 270 Irish acres is about to be sold to four persons named Cotton, whose tenancies were created by the landlord's agent for the purpose of carrying out a sale to them; and whether, seeing that the sale, if carried out, will deprive the Estates Commissioners of the opportunity of properly dealing with the small tenants and labourers of the district in regard to the enlargement of holdings and otherwise, he will take any steps to prevent a sale to these persons.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): Agreements for purchase by tenants on this estate were lodged with the Commissioners so recently as January 5th. The estate has not yet been inspected, and pending the receipt of the inspector's report the Commissioners cannot make any statement in respect to the matters mentioned in the Question.

Cavan Magistracy

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of appointments to the magisterial bench made in county Cavan during the year 1904, and say how many of such appointments were conferred on Catholics.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 322

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 885

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): Six magistrates were appointed for the county Cavan during the year 1904. It is believed they are Protestants.

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any steps have yet been taken by the Estates Commissioners to acquire the Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, which is at present in the hands of the Scottish Provident Assurance Company, and is an insolvent estate within the meaning of the Land Purchase Act, 1903.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): No application in respect of this estate has been lodged with the Estates Commissioners.

Longford Grazing Farm and Evicted Tenants.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. St. George R. Johnstone, J.P., of Kinlough, county Leitrim, is about offering for sale at Rathclive, county Longford, a grazing farm of ninety-six acres which would be suitable for the providing for evicted tenants of equivalent holdings under the Land Purchase Act, 1903; and, if so, will he direct the attention of the Estates Commissioners to this farm with a view to its purchase and sub-division amongst the evicted tenants of the county Longford.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): No application for the sale of this estate has been made to the Estates Commissioners, and I see no necessity for taking any special course with respect to the farm referred to.

Rasharkin (Antrim) Police Force.

MR. KILBRIDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many police constables have been stationed in Rasharkin, county Antrim, since Sergeant Long's appointment to that station; how many applied for transfers; and how many of those who applied for transfers were Catholics.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): Sergeant Long has been six years at this station. Sixteen constables have been at the station in that period. Of these seven, all of whom were Catholics, applied for transfers to other stations. Three of them wished to be near their native places, one was transferred for the benefit of his health, and two wished to go to better stations.

MR. KILDBIDE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what particular disease this constable was suffering from that made him wish to be transferred?

MR. ATKINSON: No.

River Drainage in Ireland.

MR. KILBRIDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Government has come to the conclusion that public money should be applied to the drainage of the River Bann; whether his attention has been directed to the proceedings of the meeting of the Joint Committee, representative of Kildare, Carlow, King's and Queen's Counties, formed for the purpose of considering the question of the Barrow drainage; and, if so, whether the Government are prepared to advance public money for the drainage of the Barrow when advancing money for the drainage of the Bann.

MR. ATKINSON (for Mr. WYNDHAM): My right hon. friend replied to a similar Question † addressed to him on Monday last by the hon. Member for South Roscommon. To that reply I have nothing to add.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is now in a position to state whether the Estates Commissioners are willing to compensate in cash or by procuring other holdings the occupants of evicted farms who are willing under those conditions to surrender them, with the object of allowing the original tenants back into their old homes.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1334.

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): I beg to refer the hon. Gentleman to the reply given by my right hon. friend on August 13th † last to a Question put to him on this subject by the hon. Member for South Kildare. I am not at present in a position to make any further statement in the matter.

Mr. CULLINAN: This a very important question. When will the right hon. Gentleman be able to give an Answer?

Mr. ATKINSON: I cannot fix a definite day.

Mr. KILBRIDE: I never got any such reply as suggested from the Chief Secretary.

Mr. ATKINSON: I will inquire into that.

Bridge Parties at Clonmel Court-House.

Mr. CULLINAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the fact that, at the last meeting of the South Tipperary County Council, held at the county Court-house at Clonmel, objection was taken to the Court-house being used by a club for social purposes; and, if so, whether he will take steps to release the county council from paying rent for and maintaining this Court-house, over which they are permitted to exercise no control, and which is being used for purposes which they do not approve of. In putting the Question the hon. Member said that its terms had been so much altered since it was handed in at the Table that the right hon. Gentleman might not be able to answer it. The phrase "social purposes" had been substituted for "a tea and bridge party."

Mr. ATKINSON (for Mr. Wyndham): In the proceedings in Committee on the Local Government Act of 1898 the question of the control of the county Court-houses was much discussed and ultimately settled by the provisions in Section 72, Sub section 3, of that Act, to which I beg to refer the hon. Member. It is not proposed to make any change in the law. I believe the High Sheriff of Tipperary has been in the habit of permitting the use, by persons of all creeds and classes, and under proper guarantees and conditions, of a portion of the Court-house for balls, concerts, and other social gatherings of that class for the convenience of the inhabitants of Clonmel and surrounding districts. A dance organised by shop assistants was given in the building on the date of the meeting of the county council referred to in the Question. Whether bridge was played or not I cannot say, but it is open to opinion whether that is a social purpose.

Mr. CULLINAN: It is evident that we have no control over the Court-house. May I ask whether the Government consent to even the High Sheriff of a county giving the Court-house, which the ratepayers are maintaining at their own expense, for the use of a club for tea and bridge parties?

Mr. ATKINSON: I must ask for notice of that Question.

The De Freyne Estate.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): May I ask the Attorney-General for Ireland if it is true that the Congested Districts Board has bought the De Freyne Estate, and, if so, upon what terms?

Mr. ATKINSON: I have only just received notice of the Question and have telegraphed for information, which I shall be most happy to communicate to the House when it arrives.

Swine Fever in Ireland.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the fact that there were only 182 outbreaks of swine fever last year in Ireland, as against 1,196 in Great Britain, the Board of Agriculture will consider the advisability of withdrawing the restrictions placed on the movement of Irish swine into Great Britain.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxl., 516.

*Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): In my printed reply to the hon. Gentleman's Question of the 20th ultimo,† I stated that owing to a difference in the meaning attached to the term outbreak in Great Britain and Ireland the numbers returned for the two countries were not comparable. I also briefly alluded to the considerations upon which the Board's recent action was based. Since then there has been no change in the circumstances necessitating a reconsideration of the matter on the part of the Board. I may add that while the total number of swine in Great Britain is 2,861,000, the total number in Ireland is 1,315,000, and that while the average number of outbreaks of swine fever in Great Britain for the first eight weeks in last year was 26·25, the outbreaks for the first eight weeks of this year have averaged 10·87.

Mr. DELANY: Can the hon. Gentleman say whether any outbreaks in Great Britain have been traceable to swine imported from Ireland?

*Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: I am afraid that is the case.

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether he can state when the Order was made and became operative in connection with the alleged cases of swine fever in Ireland; whether he can state the number of swine fever cases in existence in Ireland for thirty days prior to the Order coming into force; and also for the thirty days after the Order became operative.

*Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: The Swine Fever (Movement from Ireland) Order of 1904 became operative on January 23rd, 1905. In the four weeks ending January 21st there were three outbreaks of swine fever returned for Ireland, and during the following four weeks one. I would refer the hon. Gentleman to my reply of February 20th † to a somewhat similar Question put by the hon. Member for Queen's County. I then pointed out that the definition of the term outbreak differs materially in the two countries, and explained shortly the considerations upon which the Board's recent action was based.

Mr. FLAVIN: Are the same precautions taken to prevent the disease coming from Denmark and other Continental countries?

*Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: No live cattle from the Continent may be landed here.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): Was the Irish Board consulted by the English Department before the Order was promulgated?

*Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: Yes, the Board has been in constant communication with the Irish Department.

Painters' Dispute in Dublin.

Mr. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the difference of opinion existing between the Board of Works and the operative painters as to the employment of labourers to do painting work at the Viceregal Lodge, Dublin, he will take some expert evidence on the matter; and whether he will say what was the rough work these men were engaged on.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: One labourer only is employed part of his time at the Viceregal Lodge for rough painting work such as fencing, garden and pit frames, barrows, etc. I do not consider that expert evidence is required to decide that such work is of an unskilled description.

Mr. NANNETTI: Eighteen men have been thus employed. I shall raise this question on the Estimates.

Irish National School Teachers' Pensions.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will explain why the pension benefits of national school teachers have been reduced, seeing that the capital fund has been growing at the rate of £40,000 per annum.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 585.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The administration of the pension fund is regulated, not by a comparison of the receipts and expenditure of the present time, but by the total prospective liabilities as compared with the total prospective assets; and the changes embodied in the Irish Teachers Pension Rules, 1897, were governed by this consideration.

Phœnix Park Footpaths.

MR. COGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the use by cyclists of the footpaths in the Phœnix Park has rendered them unsafe and unfit for use by pedestrians; if so, whether, under the circumstances, the Board of Works will provide a suitable footpath for the exclusive use of the public who wish to walk in the park.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: Owing to the absence of a Park Regulations Act the Board of Works have no power to restrict the use of paths by cyclists. I am considering the advisability of introducing such an Act, in the furtherance of which I should value the co-operation of the hon. Member and his friends.

Joint Stock Companies in Dublin.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will grant a Return of the joint stock and limited liability companies in Dublin, with the valuation of all the property occupied by them, and of the total value of the respective companies, including shares, capital, and debentures.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Such of the information asked for as can be given will be found in the Return of Joint Stock Companies, 1904, No. 282. This Return will be brought up to April 30th, 1905, during the current year. No information is available with regard to the valuation of the property occupied by the companies referred to, nor with regard to the total amount of the debentures issued.

The Irish Secretaryship.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is appointed by Letters Patent signed by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland as representative of the Crown in Ireland; whether the office of Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland was determined by a change in the *personnel* of the occupant of the Lord-Lieutenancy till by statutory enactment it was provided that the tenure of the office of the Lord-Lieutenant should not be affected by a change in the holder of the Viceroyalty; and whether it is the duty of the Chief Secretary for Ireland to acquaint the Lord-Lieutenant with reference to matters of Irish policy and administration and to take his advice on such matters, whether the Lord-Lieutenant be or be not a member of the Cabinet.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Chief Secretary is appointed by a Minute signed by the Lord-Lieutenant, and he is further appointed by Letters Patent under the Privy Seal. His tenure is not affected by a change of Lord-Lieutenant. There were apparently doubts as to whether he would require re-election after a change of Lord-Lieutenant, but these doubts were set at rest by statute as far back as 1813. As to the last part of the Question, I dissent from the hon. Gentleman's view of the relations between the Lord-Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this description is taken from Lord Spencer's speech in reference to those duties?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I still dissent from that view.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I agree with Lord Spencer.

Royal Commission on Trade Disputes.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can give any information whether the Royal Commission on Trade Disputes have completed taking evidence; and when are they likely to issue their Report thereon.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Commissioners have, I understand, finished taking evidence, and are engaged in the consideration of their preliminary Report. At present they are unable to fix a day for its presentation.

The Government and the Unemployed.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the urgency of providing adequate machinery for dealing with unemployment and the distress arising therefrom, and to the practical breakdown of the efforts of the London Central and other unemployed relief committees owing to lack of funds, he will give the measure for dealing with unemployment promised in the King's Speech priority over other measures referred to therein.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand there is some exaggeration in the statement with which the hon. Gentleman's Question begins. The work of the Committee has not broken down for lack of funds, though undoubtedly I should like the amount of those funds to be increased. As regards the further Question about the order of legislation, I agree with the hon. Gentleman that it is important that a Bill should pass in the course of the present session, but I do not think it very important at what period of the session it passes. What is desirable is that the machinery should be in operation before the next period of distress is likely to become acute.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): Will any effort be made on the part of the Government to supplement the funds at present in the hands of the Central Committee? Otherwise we shall have the whole of the people starving.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope that will not be the case; but, as the hon. Gentleman will readily see, it will not be remedied by the Bill in any event.

The New High Commissioner for South Africa.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a Question of which I have given private notice—namely, whether, in recommending Lord Selborne to the Crown for appointment as High Commissioner in South Africa, he had regard to the circumstances that Lord Selborne had filled the office of Under-Secretary for the Colonies from 1895 to 1900, at the period of the Rhodes and Jameson conspiracy, the Jameson raid, and the friction between the Colonial Office and the South African Republic which led to the Boer War, and to the effect calculated to be produced by such an appointment——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! A Question in that form would not be put on the Paper.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite willing to answer it.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Well, answer.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I am not at all objecting to the hon. Gentleman's right to ask a Question in proper form on the subject of the appointment of Lord Selborne; but the hon. Member was putting his Question in rhetorical language that would not be permitted on the Paper. I think he had better frame his Question in more suitable language.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman state what will be the business next week?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope to get the Speaker out of the Chair on the Navy Estimates on Monday. I shall go on with Supply on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Either Navy Estimates or Supplementary Estimates will be taken. The Estimates will be in the Vote Office this evening.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said that last year the House were hustled in dealing with the Navy Estimates. This year questions of exceptional importance arose, and he hoped arrangements would be made to give the House at least a week for the consideration of those Estimates before they were taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the hon. Gentleman would see that the request was somewhat unreasonable. He agreed that very broad questions of principle were raised by the Navy Estimates this year; but the principles had long been before the House and the country with official authority, and on those broad principles he thought the House were already fully armed with the information they desired to obtain.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman be content with getting the Speaker out of the Chair on the Navy Estimates without taking the Vote.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to consider that suggestion. I certainly do not negative it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Do I understand that the right hon. Gentleman does not propose to move the Speaker out of the Chair on the Civil Service or Army Estimates next week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked whether it was intended that the Secretary to the Admiralty should make his introductory statement with the Speaker in the Chair or wait for Committee to be opened.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) desired to know whether hon. Members who were successful in the ballot would be allowed to bring in their Motions before the statement on behalf of the Government was made. That, he believed, was the old and better practice of the House.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: And in case the statement is made with Mr. Speaker in the Chair will the right hon. Gentleman see that the hon. Member making it does not monopolise the greater part of the time available?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he believed it would be much more to the convenience of the House to follow the recent practice than to go back to the old practice. The House and the country ought to be greatly interested in the new naval policy which his hon. friend would propound to the House. It would be most undesirable that all the edge of the interest should be taken off by a series of miscellaneous discussions upon details. He thought it would be better to begin the Navy Estimates with a broad statement of the policy of the Government.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would bear in mind what took place five or six years ago when Mr. Goschen made the statement. After the principle had been approved the debate was adjourned in order that details might be considered.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: As a point of order, is it not for you, Mr. Speaker, to decide who shall be heard first. Formerly private Members had the first hearing, but of late years the practice has grown up for the Minister to make his statement first.

*MR. SPEAKER: The old practice was that when the Navy Estimates were called on for the first time the Minister formally moved, and the Speaker thereupon called upon the Member who was first in the ballot. Then the practice grew up which I have no control over, that the Minister should make a long statement before moving that I should leave the Chair. That statement he formerly used to make in Committee. Then it appeared to me to be more fair and convenient that in such a case some hon. Member representing the Opposition on Navy matters should have an opportunity of making some general observations on the statement before the first name in the ballot was called. That I understand to be the recent practice. If it is thought undesirable that a Member should be called upon to make general observations in reply before the ballot comes on, that is a matter the House can settle itself.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Would it not be competent, Sir, for any Member to move that a certain Member be now heard—the Member, for instance, in charge of a Motion?

*MR. SPEAKER: No, I think it would not. That is a form used in the House of Lords when two Members both claim to speak, because the Speaker there has no authority to decide such a question, but the practice here is different.

Mr. **LOUGH**: Have we no remedy then?

Mr. **SPEAKER**: Order, order!

NEW BILLS.

VACCINATION BILL.

"To amend the Law in respect to the procedure of officers and justices of the peace administering the several Vaccination Acts," presented by Mr. Philip Stanhope; supported by Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Channing, Mr. Levy, and Sir Charles McLaren; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 77.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894," presented by Mr. Cathcart Wason; supported by Sir William Arrol, Mr. Weir, Sir Andrew Agnew, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Alexander Cross, Mr. Harmsworth, Colonel Denny, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. James Reid, Mr. John Dewar, and Sir John Batty Tuke; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 78.]

LIGHT RAILWAYS BILL.

"To continue and amend The Light Railways Act, 1896," presented by Mr. Gerald Balfour; supported by Mr. Bonar Law; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 79.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL.

"To amend the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1900," presented by Mr. Gerald Balfour; supported by Mr. Bonar Law; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 80.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1904–5 (SOMALILAND).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £550,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Additional Expenditure in respect of the following Army Services, viz.:—

		£
Vote 1.	Pay, etc., of the Army	985,000
,, 2.	Medical Establishments, Pay, etc.	21,000
,, 6.	Transport and Remounts	265,000
,, 7.	Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies	260,000
,, 12.	Miscellaneous Effective Services	2,000
,, 14.	Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other non-effective charges for Officers, etc	1,000
,, 15	Pensions and other non-effective charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others	2,000
		1,536,000
Less Surpluses on other Votes		386,000
		1,150,000
Deduct Excess Appropriations-in-Aid		600,000
		£550,000"

Mr **GIBSON BOWLES** (Lynn Regis) asked whether this was a supplementary or additional sum.

The **CHAIRMAN**: It is both.

*The **FINANCIAL SECRETARY** to the **WAR OFFICE** (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield), who was indistinctly heard, said he thought it would perhaps be less inaccurate to call this an additional Estimate. The House would remember that the Supplementary Estimate of last year provided for the expenditure in Somaliland down to the end of that year. The ordinary Estimates for this year made no provision for Somaliland, but the House was informed that additional Estimates would be taken, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that he had taken £500,000 in his Budget for that purpose. The Estimate now before the House provided for the cost of the operations from April 1st, 1904, down to their close and also for the maintenance of the temporary garrison which was kept in the country down to the date of its return to India. If the temporary garrison had been withdrawn, as was anticipated, by November 30th, the sum of £500,000 taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer last year would have sufficed, but as the troops did not leave till December 29th, this Estimate arose for their maintenance until their return to India. It would be right if he informed the House of what had been the cost of the Somaliland operations since they were taken over by the War Office. The figures were as follows:—1902–3, £252,000; 1903–4, £1,618,000; 1904–5 (the present Estimate), £550,000—Total, £2,420,000.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): And what expenditure did the Foreign Office incur before that?

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: The sum to be added in respect of that is £37,640, giving a total cost which might be roughly described as £2,500,000.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is not this sum raised to £3,200,000 by appropriations-in-aid?

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT replied in the negative. The sum he had stated covered the total amount expended in warlike operations. He was not in a position to give the details as to the way in which the money had been expended. The war was conducted by the Government of India for this country, and Indian troops were employed and maintained on the Indian scale. All the Government of India had done was to send the general figures representing the total amount they had expended on the operations. We purchased from the Indian Government stores, clothing, and ammunition to the value of £100,000; but of that £30,000 went back to India, and could not, of course, be included in the cost of the war. Possibly he had erred in giving so many details on the Estimate, but he believed that the supply of full information in this manner was calculated to shorten debate. The Estimate was not merely an additional Estimate in respect of Somaliland, but also a Supplementary Estimate in respect of certain sums of money required to meet deficits on certain of the Votes. He could assure the Committee that for many reasons this expenditure was entirely unavoidable, and that every possible economy had been effected during the past year. It was only by the most careful and constant watching that they had put themselves in the position to ask the House for so small a sum in respect of these operations. He agreed that the interception of appropriations-in-aid had grown to proportions which the House of Commons had hitherto never contemplated, but when they reverted to conditions of peace he hoped they would revert also to the old conditions, when appropriations-in-aid were not nearly so large as at present. There had been during the first year of administration of his right hon. friend the Member for West Belfast at the War Office a saving of between £9,000,000 and £10,000,000.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is this in order on this Vote? If so I shall be quite ready to answer the hon. Gentleman on this point.

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said he would not attempt to argue whether it was proper that there should be appropriations-in-aid, but he would like to point out that the past few years had not been normal years, and these appropriations were only intercepted with the assent of the House in Committee of Supply.

There were two main causes for the deficits. The first was the excess strength of the Army. Certain changes had been anticipated, involving large reductions, which had not taken place at the beginning of the year. One was the reduction of garrison regiments and another the reduction of the South African garrison. The garrison in South Africa was not reduced in numbers at the beginning of the year as had been expected, nor had the garrison regiments been reduced. They estimated for the return of three cavalry regiments at the beginning of the year, but they did not return until August, and that had affected the Votes. South Africa was, perhaps, the most expensive station in the world, and the cost of maintaining troops there was enormously greater than elsewhere, the price of everything consumed by the troops being especially great. The price of forage was enormously greater. The situation during the current year had been such that, from a military point of view, it was deemed extremely imprudent to part with the horses and transport animals of all kinds in South Africa which would be required in the event of war. [Hon. MEMBERS on the OPPOSITION Benches: War, where?] With respect to the excess strength of the Army, a larger number of men had to be maintained during the year than had been estimated for. In regard to Vote I. and all other Army Votes, it could not be too often repeated that the cost of the Army was built up on the cost of each individual man. It was necessary to take into account not only the pay of every man but the cost of his arms, ammunition, food, housing, clothing, ambulance, hospital, and all the other necessary requisites of equipment. But it might be asked, why they did not reduce the Army? Why did they not get rid of the men they did not require? They had tried to, but could not. They had done their best to get rid of the three-years men who were not required. Inducements had been offered to them to go into the Reserve where they were wanted, but without avail. The Reserve had been depleted by the war in South Africa, but the three-years men would not go into it. Neither would they extend their term of enlistment so as to become qualified for service in India. The qualification for India was that the man must have had four years service, be an efficient soldier, and twenty years of age; and no three-years man could in any circumstances be qualified for service in India. Provision, however, had been made for the Indian drafts. Few people realised the dangers in which we were placed in respect to the Indian service. He supposed people imagined that it was all right because they had plenty of recruits. The difficulty was not to get men into the Army, but when there, to induce them to extend their service so as to make them available for India. Accordingly, his right hon. friend took the step of stopping all recruiting of three-years men, and refused to accept any except for nine years. That step had been brilliantly successful, and the situation, so far as India was concerned, had been saved. But they had not saved money. He was certain, however, that the money had been well spent in enlisting these nine-years men, and that they would repay by their services that money over and over again.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that the Financial Secretary to the War Office had stated that everything was being done to improve the general staff. He contended that the state of the War Office was worse than ever, and he moved the reduction of Vote 1, Item A by £100.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-Head A (Pay, etc., of General Staff) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he wanted to know whether this Item A included the extra money paid towards the expenses of the Intelligence Department. Particularly, was it to be utilised in sending out Intelligence Officers to the seat of war in Manchuria to study the progress of the campaign there? He did not suppose there ever had been a war showing such fruitful lessons. The South African War taught us a great deal, and he hoped we had laid those lessons to heart, but the war now going on between Russia and Japan was still more fruitful in lessons which were of interest to the British Army and people. He wanted to know whether Generals Ian Hamilton and Nicholson and their subordinate officers were learning something of the new developments of artillery in Manchuria, as to what form of artillery ammunition was found most effective in that climate, and as to the employment of big guns. [OPPOSITION cries of "Order, order!"]

*THE CHAIRMAN said he did not think the hon. and gallant Member would be entitled to go into every conceivable question of military investigation. He was quite entitled to ask questions as to what officers were on the Vote and if they performed their duties; but he could not discuss what subjects these officers were likely to report on.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said that much had been heard about the merits of the long and the short rifle, and he wanted to know if in the reports they were likely to get light which would lead to the understanding of that subject. He himself was very much interested in the medical and hospital work in the armies in the Far East, which he understood to be very effective; and he wanted to know whether any report would be received on that subject. Then there was the question as to whether the bayonet was an effective weapon. [Cries of "Order."] There had been actual experience of bayonet combats in this war. [Renewed cries of "Order."]

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs), on a point of order, held that the hon. and gallant Gentleman was not entitled to discuss such details under this Vote.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he did not think the hon. and gallant Member was entitled to go into all these details. The question which arose on Item A was as to whether the Government were right in sending out a certain number of officers, to make inquiries and report, whether they sent too few or too many, or sent them to the right places and so forth; and not what they were going to do when they got there.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said he would like to know how many officers were sent out, where these officers were or are, and whether they had been able to do satisfactorily the work which they had been sent to do. There was another point; had the Intelligence Department been extended sufficiently for the purposes likely to be set before it? It had been held by the other side that the Intelligence Department had not been so extended. Were these officers likely to get good information for the edification of the British Army?

SIR. J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said he wished the Committee to observe that although they were discussing a most serious subject affecting the efficiency of the Army, which they all professed a desire to promote, the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment had given no reason for the reduction. That was very surprising. He should have thought that the question of the general staff should not be treated in that contemptuous manner, but should have the hearty approval of the House of Commons. Every Army reformer had for years been pointing out the great need there was for such a body of skilled officers. Under the administration of the Secretary of State for War they now had, for the first time, a general staff on the footing of other armies. He apprehended that the Army Council was also included in the Vote. No more effective change than that highly trained officers should, through the Secretary of State, direct the affairs of the Army was possible. It was a very substantial reform; and ought to have the respectful attention of the House.

*COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said he wished to know whether it was possible to reduce a sum of money which the Committee was not asked to vote. This was an additional Estimate for £550,000 in connection with Somaliland. He doubted whether the general staff was included in that Vote. But if he were in order in discussing it, he should like to ask various questions about it, as it was one of the most important things connected with the Army. It was really a new departure on the part of the Secretary of State for War; and he should like to know its precise position. Any one who had studied the organisation of foreign armies knew that the general staff was the nerve system of the Army. Without a general staff the Japanese could not have won the victories they had in the Far East, nor could the Germans have won their victories in 1870. He should like to know if the general staff was on the same footing as the general staffs of foreign armies. He also wished to know for what the amount now asked for was required; and whether the reduction which had been moved was on any general item or whether it meant the condemnation of the general staff. He did not know how the hon. Gentleman opposite imagined the Army could be worked without a general staff. The more effective the general staff the better the Army would be prepared for war.

*Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said that the hon. Gentleman opposite, in his very brief speech, gave one reason, and one only, for the omission of the sub-head; and that was entirely inaccurate. That reason was that the War Office was badly administered; but the sub-head had no reference to the administration of the War Office. The money was in respect of payments to the Army; and his hon. friends were correct in saying that the greater part of it was for officers sent out to Manchuria to report on the war. Eleven officers were sent out to the Japanese Army, including Sir William Nicholson and Sir Ian Hamilton. The remainder was explained in this way. When the Estimates were drawn up a reduction was anticipated which had not yet been realised. They had looked a little too far ahead. The Report of the Committee which considered the matter was at present before the Army Council; and he could assure the House that the saving they had anticipated would be realised. They were now asking the Committee for the amount by which the Army Estimates had been reduced as compared with the preceding year.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 153; Noes, 202. (Division List No. 17.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cogan, Denis J.
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S Andrw's Bghs.
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mooney, John J.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William

Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. HnC. R(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, ArthurWalters(NDorset
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Warner.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson(King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, SirT. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. SirJohn E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt, Hn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir RB. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. Sir F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG. (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, SirJames(Staffords. NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John(Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, JohnGrant(Yorks. N. R
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert

Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart,SirH.(Renfrew.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Rt.Hon.Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M‘Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

*SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall) drew attention to the increase of expenditure for the general staff, and pointed out that the effect of the increase this year was to neutralise the reduction made in the previous year. With regard to extra-regimental expenditure under Sub-head C., it had been truly said by the Secretary of State for War that what really governed the amount of the Estimates was the number of men; but when the country was asked to pay a sum of £9,000,000 in respect of this item, the House would see where a large reduction might be made. The Secretary of State for War had promised to reduce the battalions which were created for the purposes of the Boer War. That would seem to be a natural reduction, but those battalions still existed. Another natural reduction would be in the garrison at Malta, which consisted of nine regiments of the Line, although there was no larger artillery garrison there than at Gibraltar, where only three regiments of the Line were stationed. In his opinion it would be most desirable to reduce this enormous Vote by the diminution of the unnecessary garrisons maintained at Malta and elsewhere. The number of men entitled to deferred pay had been so largely diminished that last year the amount voted on that account was reduced by £304,000; but now an additional number of men came forward who were supposed to be entitled to deferred pay amounting to £10,000. He wished to know how this had arisen. The whole House would welcome the provision of £500,000 for the Army Reserve, because the more the country had of seasoned troops the better. He wished to know, however, whether the increase of £400,000 was on account of the nine-years service men. He intended to raise on a future occasion the question whether the adoption of the system of nine years service was advisable, seeing that many experts considered that term to be three years too long for service in India. Referring to an item "Proceeds of sale of cast animals and surplus stores," he stated that the Public Accounts Committee had had a great deal of trouble over the sales of surplus stores in South Africa, and nobody reading that Committee's Report could doubt that there had been enormous miscalculations of accounts. In some cases it was not known whether the sales had been by public tender or private treaty, and certainly in one case the price was much lower than the sum advertised as the minimum that would be taken. Saddles, for instance, were bought that were unfit for the men to sit in, and were sold for a shilling each. Then there was the considerable loss of £32,000 upon 11,000 horses which were sold by contract, the contractor in question having become bankrupt after he had paid £50,000 of the £80,000 which was the contract sum, and there being no security whatever behind him the country had to bear the loss. He hoped that in future the authorities at the War Office would watch more closely the way in which surplus stores were disposed of. Similar occurrences to those which he had mentioned happened in connection with the breaking up of the concentration camps. No store accounts had been kept, and consequently no stock-taking was possible, and it could not be ascertained whether losses were being incurred.

The paragraph in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee to which he particularly invited attention was as follows—

> "In addition to £1,381,000 received from the Crown Agents for blockhouses, stores, and animals, there were numerous sales of surplus stores by Military Boards and Army Departments. In regard to the latter, it was noticed that large quantities of surplus supplies were sold below the minimum rate at which tenders were invited. Your Committee are of opinion that in future officers conducting sales should be instructed to report how the sales were conducted, viz., by public tender or private treaty, and whether the best prices obtainable were realised."

These matters were now past, but as the House had had no opportunity of considering the Committee's Report he had ventured to refer to the matter on the present occasion.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) asked how much of this Supplementary Estimate was due to the South African War. It would be difficult to ascertain exactly the total expenses of the war; possibly the sum would never be arrived at accurately, but it was the duty of Members to do their best. If the right hon. Gentleman would state generally how much of the Estimate was entailed by that war he would put the Committee in possession of valuable information. He could confirm the remarks of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Walsall as to the difficulty the Public Accounts Committee had had in dealing with these matters, and the injury which had been and was being done to the interests of the British taxpayers in consequence. As to the "Increased Colonial Contributions and Miscellaneous Receipts," he presumed they were practically all increased colonial contributions. He also asked whether it was not somewhat unusual for so large a sum as £160,000 out of the contribution from India to be credited to a Supplementary Estimate instead of to the main Estimates for the year.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) complained of the unsatisfactory form of the Vote, and asked whether he was not correct in saying that the sum asked for for new purposes was not £550,000 but £1,536,000, the difference being met by transfers of excesses from other Votes. The Public Accounts Committee evidently did not approve of this method of making the accounts appear smaller than they really were, because in their Report they called attention—

> "To the constant practice of obtaining Treasury authority for the application of savings under one Vote to meet deficiencies in another and totally different Vote."

Surely some regard ought to be paid by the Secretary of State for War to that expression of opinion. With regard to the Vote for the general staff, for a period of three months during the time of the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor double pay was given in consequence of there being two sets of officers holding the same appointments. That condition of things was brought about by the setting up of the Army Corps scheme in such a hurry. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to assure the Committee that there were no such dual appointments in consequence of the abolition of that scheme in a similar hurry. The Committee would doubtless remember that the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor was sharply reprimanded by the Public Accounts Committee for having diverted for the purpose of those dual salaries a portion of the £5,000 allocated to the Secretary of State for War. He trusted nothing of the sort was being done in the present Vote. Unless that sort of thing was put a stop to, there would be no end to the possible claims on that £5,000 for objects altogether different from those for which the money was voted. The fund was allocated to a clear and definite purpose, but in the very first year of its existence the then Secretary of State for War used it for a purpose altogether contrary to the regulations. That was a gross misuse of public money, and he hoped the present Secretary of State for War would give an assurance that nothing of the kind was being permitted during the current year.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) asked whether the last paragraph on page 3 of the Supplementary Estimates indicated a re-sale of stores to India which were not wanted for the campaign in Somaliland or in South Africa, and for which money had been recovered from India.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.) said he would reply in the first place to the right hon. Baronet the Member for Walsall. It was a fact that the War Office authorities had not got rid of men from the Army as rapidly as they had hoped and anticipated would be the case. As long as the present demand on the Army existed it was impossible to get rid of men unless there were others to replace them. When he spoke of dispensing with the fourteen battalions it was always on condition that they should be replaced by other units available for service in India. But that would not hasten the reduction. Men who were serving on engagements could be got rid of only at the end of their engagements, or by their voluntarily passing into the Reserve at an earlier period. In the early part of the year the War Office authorities were unable to allow them to pass prematurely into the Reserve. They took the ordinary course of allowing men to pass into the Reserve in the third year. The Army had now been reduced to its normal figure, but the excess in the infantry would not only be wiped out but far more. It was the deliberate opinion of the Army Council that it was better to continue recruiting nine-years men this year rather than allow the regiments to go on in the condition in which they stood. With regard to Malta, the garrison there had been fixed after a careful review of the general needs of defence. He was not prepared to say whether that allocation was correct or not. The establishments of the Mediterranean garrisons would be somewhat reduced. With regard to deferred pay they estimated that there would be a large reduction, which they placed at £304,000. It was exceedingly difficult when dealing with a large number of individuals acting according to their own caprice to know what would be their collective requirements during the year. Their estimate was exceedingly close, but they were £10,000 short, and that was the reason why this amount appeared in the Estimate. There was no foundation for the suggestion that they were paying more for the nine-years men than for any other class. They were now getting men who would relieve them of a great expenditure in the future, but they were not paying any more for the nine-years man than the three-years man at the present time.

With regard to the Accounts, no one would pretend that the transactions which took place during the South African War were those which they would like to continue during peace. The Army Council had taken the best steps in its power to minimise in future the evils arising from the absence of financial control, they were educating officers at the War Office who would take charge of financial matters, and they had laid down the principle that there should be a financial staff attached to all regiments in the field, and such a staff had already been attached to the regiments at home. He had been asked for an explanation in regard to the Colonial appropriations-in-aid. As a matter of fact there had been two windfalls, viz., the recovery of a debt from Sierra Leone, and an additional payment by the Colony of Ceylon due to the increased prosperity of that island, the contribution having a fixed proportion to the revenue. The hon. Member for Halifax seemed to be under a misapprehension in regard to the total of this Estimate. The actual additional sum was £1,150,000, but the hon. Member had not taken into account the savings. The actual excess appropriations-in-aid were £600,000, and £550,000 was on account of Somaliland. There were no instances where one officer was being given two appointments, nor were there likely to be any. At the present moment he could not say how much of this expenditure belonged to the South African War.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) asked if they had come to the end of these charges. He should like to know how much had been recovered since peace was proclaimed, and what the amount was of these charges which belonged to South Africa.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said this was not a matter arising on this Vote, but he would inquire if such information could be furnished.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) moved a reduction of Item A by £10,000. The

Secretary for War had said in regard to the Volunteers that it was not so much a question of numbers as efficiency that was required, but in regard to the general staff exactly the opposite policy was being pursued. They were not getting men with more experience in warfare, but were simply increasing the staff and giving the members of it all sorts of work which they would not have to perform in time of war. They had twice as many general officers in proportion to the number of men as other countries, and this was why our Army was costing a great deal more. The Committee had been led to understand that alterations in the Intelligence Department had given rise to a portion of this Vote, but those alterations did not come under this Vote at all; neither did the Army Council. This Vote simply meant an increase of the general staff all over the country at a time when we were supposed to be reducing the Army. For these reasons he thought there were very strong reasons against this increase. Many of these items were due to bad estimates by the War Office, for they were 10 per cent. too small and that was very serious. The country could not stand these enormous expenses, and they ought to have from the Secretary for War some actual proof that economy was being practised and some assurance that the right hon. Gentleman's pledges in the direction of economy were not mere words and promises. He begged to move a reduction in the Vote by £10,000.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head A (Pay, etc., of General Staff) be reduced by £10,000."—(*Mr Courtenay Warner.*)

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) asked for a clear explanation as to the proportion of the £15,000 which was allocated to the officers who went to Japan and Manchuria—the officers with the Japanese army and those with the Russian army. He should also like to know whether any portion of the Vote was for a certain number of officers who went out to Japan under the impression that they would be allowed to go to the front, but who, as a matter of fact, simply remained in Japan to study the language. It seemed to him that a certain proportion of the £15,000 must necessarily be for a number of officers who were doing duty under the new scheme and a certain proportion for those who were doing duty under the rejected scheme. He wanted to know what proportion of the amount had been caused by the change from one policy to another.

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said the hon. Member for Lichfield seemed disposed to credit the War Office with a foresight which he could not claim for it. The hon. Member suggested that they ought to have included in the Estimates last year the pay and allowances of certain officers who went out to witness the proceedings in Manchuria. The Estimates were made up in October and November and presented in January and February. The war was declared on 6th February last year, and his hon. friend could hardly say that the War Office ought to have anticipated the sending out of officers for any such purpose.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked who were the officers who would absorb the £10,000. When the Committee received that information they would be able to judge whether this extra expenditure was caused by a certain number of appointments which were made under the Army Corps scheme. That was what they wished to arrive at. Another point on which he wished information was in connection with the officers of the Indian Army. Was it not the case that India paid the expenses of these officers? He had himself raised an objection in that House to the cost of a British officer being placed on the Indian establishment—that was to say, that India should be paying while the officer was one who ought to be paid for by the British Government.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said £5,000 was due to the expenses of the officers sent to Manchuria. He presumed that was for extra expenses paid by this country in respect of the officers who went to Manchuria over and above what was contributed by the Indian Government. If that was not so it was clear that the Indian Government ought to contribute a certain portion of the £5,000.

*Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT was understood to indicate assent.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that what they wanted to know was the cause of the increased expenditure of £10,000. The Financial Secretary said it was not an increase of expenditure, that it was the result of a saving that had not yet been realised. How was it a saving if the money was spent? He wanted to know how much of the £10,000 had been paid under the head of "general staff" irrespective of the officers in Manchuria. The hon. Gentleman could easily put the Committee at rest if he would tell them the names of the officers in question, and their rank, or in general terms indicate the causes of the outlay. The general staff of our Army was more expensive in proportion to the number of men than that of any other army in the world, except, perhaps, that of the Venezuelan army. There was a very shrewd suspicion on his side of the House that the reason for paying this £10,000 more was that the débris of the Army Corps system had left a great number of appointments which were not now operative, and that in consequence the taxpayer was a considerable loser. Until the hon. Gentleman was able to explain more clearly than he had done the reasons why a saving which was anticipated had not been realised he did not think the Committee could possibly allow this Vote to proceed any further.

*Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said he thought he had already explained the matter. The hon. Gentleman had raised the question of the staff which, he considered, cost too much. A Committee had been sitting to inquire into this very question. The Committee had reported making certain recommendations, the effect of which would be to reduce considerably the cost of the staff. These recommendations were now before the Treasury.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said the hon. Gentleman had not even attempted to answer the question. He asked the reason why the saving had not been realised, and what new officers were being employed whom last year it was not expected would be employed at the present time. It was a simple question. Let there be no misunderstanding. If the hon. Gentleman did not know he had better say so, and the Committee would see whether they could go on with the Vote or not.

*Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said it was absolutely unreasonable that he should be asked to give the names of the officers.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL asked the hon. Gentleman to state whether the officers were generals and majors on the staff, or connected with the active and combatant ranks of the Army, or with the transport and organisation, or whether they were artillery officers, cavalry officers, or infantry officers. Surely the hon. Gentleman had not come down to the House without knowing what officers had rendered a cost of £10,000 necessary.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES thought the question of the hon. Member for Oldham was unreasonable. The Minister was dependent for his information as to details on the Departmental staff. The Minister who sat on the front bench was dependent on the men who sat in the officials' gallery for all his information and for most of his brains. It was not fair to ask for details of this kind. They were not dealing now with the Vote for the general staff, but with the balance of the appropriations-in-aid which had not been estimated before. The heading of the Vote described with absolute accuracy what they were asked to vote for. It was as follows—

> "Estimate of the Amount required during the year ending 31st March, 1905, to meet Expenditure on the Military Operations in Somaliland, for which no provision was made in the Original Army Estimates for the Year; also to authorise the appropriation of certain Receipts, in excess of those included in the Original Army Estimates for the Year, to defray expenditure in excess of the sums therein provided for Army services other than the Somaliland Operations."

His view was that the Vote was in order to give full information to the Committee. The only money which they were asked to vote that day was really for Somaliland and Manchuria. Of course the Vote raised enormous questions. Were it a Supplementary Estimate the policy of the original Estimate could not be raised. There had been a ruling given to that effect. But this was not a Supplementary Vote at all. It was an additional Vote, and the whole policy of Somaliland could be raised on it, past, present, and future. The history of Somaliland might be entered into from the days of Adam and Eve down to the present time. He could conceive, however, that it was not desirable to raise matters which did not arise except as accidental and incidental to the Vote.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that they were indebted to the hon. Member for King's Lynn for the information he had given to the Committee, but the hon. Gentleman had been asking questions which were germane to the item on the Paper. They were of real and substantial importance and were connected with the staff of the Army. A question had been put to the representative of the War Office, and that hon. Gentleman had had plenty of time to go under the gallery to get the information wanted, but he had not yet answered the simple question put to him. In what direction were the War Office spending this money? It was not enough to tell the Committee that they had hoped to make certain economies, but had not been able to do so. There must be some reason, and the Committee should know it. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would be able to explain in general terms, if he was not able to give the names of the officers, their rank and the Army in which they served. He trusted also that the right hon. Gentleman was better acquainted with this Army Vote than his subordinate.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he was sorry that the hon. Member for King's Lynn had thought it necessary to make so unusually discourteous a remark about his hon. friend. As to the staff, it was contemplated that they would have been able to reorganise the whole of the Army commands and put many of the posts now held by individual officers—some colonels, some major-generals — on a different footing as regarded emoluments and the rank they held. The War Office had anticipated that they would have made greater progress than had been actually accomplished. They had had long and continuous conferences at the War Office in regard to the officers appropriated to all the new organisation. But there were officers holding posts who were entitled under their appointment——

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: Under the Army Corps?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Officers of the rank of generals in the Army, and it was proposed that the reorganised posts should be held by officers of a lower rank. But the present staff officers could not be displaced at once or deprived of their emoluments. Considerable progress had already been made in cheapening the cost of many of these posts, and they would be able, as soon as the Treasury sanction was obtained, to carry out those changes all over the country. On account of the impossibility of dealing with the position of individual officers, it could not be said on what day or month the transfer and change of officers would be made to individual posts.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL asked if there had been no increase in the cost of the general staff for the current year? Had this £15,000 been added to the cost which was charged on the Estimates last year?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that there had been a reduction of £4,000; but the whole reduction anticipated had not been effected. The hon. Member must be aware of the great complications involved in this matter.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said it was quite clear that there had been some reductions in certain cases. He knew that the colonels in depots had been reduced in number. But the promise which the Secretary for War gave last year in the discussion on the Army Estimates was that these reductions would be so great that they would meet the extra expenditure on other branches. The extra expenditure had come in, but not the reductions. In fact, there was an increase in the expenditure on the Army and no reduction had been made on this

Vote as promised. Under these circumstances he thought the Opposition were bound to stick to the Motion for the reduction of the Vote. The Secretary for War, with all his vast knowledge and great ability, had been unable to carry out these small economies, although pledged to them; and if they did not begin with the small economies the opportunity for securing big economies next year would be lost.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he did not gather from the explanation the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War had given to the hon. Member for Oldham how far any part of this £15,000 put down on the Estimate was due to the new scheme promulgated in the special Army Order issued in the middle of January last. In that Order there was a large and new division of the United Kingdom into zones of defence, fresh commands, and one thing and another. If that scheme had been put into operation it must have involved a large cost for staff officers. How far had there been any increase in the cost of the Army from that scheme, and, if there had been any increase, how much of it was represented by the present Vote? The Financial Secretary to the War Office said that the cost of the present staff was too much; how much would the new staff cost?

MR. McKENNA said that the hon. and gallant Member opposite had twitted him with being extremely brief in moving the previous reduction. But the Financial Secretary to the War Office insisted on the Committee not wasting time in discussing that item; therefore he had put his Amendment in the briefest terms. In his previous remarks he had said that the state of the War Office was worse than ever; he should have said the War Office administration. It now appeared that the Secretary of State for War anticipated that he would have been able to clear up the existing muddle in the War Office more rapidly than he had been able to do; and the right hon. Gentleman apparently regretted as much as they on the Opposition side of the House did that the muddle still existed. In spite of the censure of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite he maintained that he was absolutely justified in moving his Amendment in the terms he had done.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked if the Committee were to understand that this item covered the pay of certain officers in Somaliland?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No.

MR. DALZIEL said he would then defer his remarks on that expedition to another occasion.

* MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) asked what part of this amount for the pay of the general staff was due to the late six Army Corps scheme? The Committee should get some information on that point. Had the right hon. Gentleman been able to save the cost of the staff of the Army Corps scheme of his predecessor, or was the right hon. Gentleman still paying for the general staff then set up?

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said they had been told that the cost of the Army staff under Item A was a reduction of £4,000 on the Estimates voted last year. Did he understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that the Estimate last year was not £281,000 but £285,000 under the head of general staff. Had the right hon. Gentleman failed to prevent an increase or merely failed to make a reduction on the Vote? Was the Item under heading A more than the similar Vote last year.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: £1,000 more.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that the right hon. Gentleman explained that he had been carrying out a policy of retrenchment, but had failed. He had not been able to reduce this Vote by so much as he anticipated—only by £4,000. But now they were told that after reducing it by £4,000 the total amount was £1,000 more.

* MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that they must compare like with like. There was an item here which was not in last year's Vote at all—an entirely

unforeseen contingency due to the war. What he had said was absolutely correct.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he was obliged to his right hon. friend for his explanation, which met the point fully. He hoped his right hon. friend would not think that there was any suggestion that he was not as fully acquainted with the multifarious details involved in the War Department as far as any man could be. The explanation of his right hon. friend was clear; but it did not remove the unsatisfactory fact that he had failed to make the economies in the general staff of the Army which he anticipated. He did not reproach his right hon. friend for that. Everyone knew that when officers got special forms of employment they could not be dismissed or reduced to ordinary regimental duties or put on half pay. They would have to serve out their terms of service, and economy would, therefore, necessarily be a gradual process. There was no personal reproach to his right hon. friend in supporting the reduction. He would support it because the general staff had for a long period of time showed a great and steady tendency to increase. His right hon. friend was aware of that. He was also evidently aware that money had been wasted on the staff of the Army and that economies were possible. His right hon. friend regretted he was only able to effect half the economies which he regarded as desirable and possible. He himself believed that the pressure which was exercised in former years by the House of Commons had given the right hon. Gentleman some leverage, some backing, in his attemps to procure a reduction of the unnecessary money wasted on the staff of the Army. He did not mean the Intelligence Branch. He referred to the gold-braided functionaries with ornamental duties at Aldershot and Salisbury Plain. They were bound, however, to criticise the expenditure in order to encourage the right hon. Gentleman to make reductions. They would vote for a reduction which the right hon. Gentleman admitted was necessary, and which he hoped to achieve this year. He should therefore support his hon. friends in the division.

*Mr. McCRAE asked what part of the cost necessary in connection with the Army Corps scheme still remained on the Vote. When the Estimates before the Committee were presented they erew told that they were not real Estimates, because they dealt with a scheme which had been abolished. He thought it it would be convenient if the right hon. Gentleman would state what proportion of the amount was retained for the general staff under the new scheme.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he could not give the details off-hand.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE asked what would be the reduced cost under the new scheme.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the hon. Gentleman had better wait for the Estimates. The details had not yet received the sanction of the Treasury.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that there were certain officers now serving under a special Army Order. What part of the Estimate referred to them.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that a large part of the new organisation had not yet been carried out, as the details had not been yet sanctioned by the Treasury. They had adopted a system of grading which had not yet received the sanction of the Treasury; meantime the officers were engaged on their work. If the hon. Gentleman would wait until the Estimates were before the House he would be prepared to make a full explanation.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he wished to ask a question with reference to Somaliland.

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman cannot discuss Somaliland on the question before the House.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he did not desire to discuss Somaliland; but it appeared to him that the money for Item A was not being provided out of the Estimates, but out of the appropriation of extra receipts. What were those extra receipts? Were the War Office following the usual course in this matter? It appeared to him they were redistributing the original Estimates as the

Treasury did under the Appropriation Act.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the Estimate was made out in accordance with the wishes of the Public Accounts Committee, and gave more information than in its previous form.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that the right hon. Gentleman stated that the Army Estimates would be laid before Parliament shortly.

*The CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant to this item.

Mr WINSTON CHURCHILL said he only mentioned it because the right hon. Gentleman stated that his explanation with regard to the general staff would be given on the Army Estimates. The right hon. Gentleman had answered the question put to him, and had explained very fully to the House the reason why he had failed to achieve his hopes of reduction. But he would not think them unreasonable if they continued to press for that reduction by the only means by which that reduction could be pressed, namely, by a division.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 175; Noes, 227. (Division List, No. 18.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,M.Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay,Alexander(Lanark,NE
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt.Hn.Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol,E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson,Dr.Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Partick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F.X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P.J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P.J.
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.

Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C.R(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F.W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters(N. Dorset
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse, SirJ T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Warner and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt Hn. J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHn. J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B.(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzgerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn Edward Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J.E.(Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHn Lord G. Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Sir James(Staffords. NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hornre, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John(Kent Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney. Rt. Hon. Col. W
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th)
Lawson, John Grant(Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert

Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

CAPTAIN NORTON in moving the reduction of Item C by £100,000, said he sympathised with the Secretary of State for War in his inability to carry out the scheme of Army reform which he had laid before the country. One half of the right hon. Gentleman's scheme had absolutely broken down. The right hon. Gentleman, owing to the impossibility of obtaining men for service in India, had been compelled to take these nine-years service men, and had been therefore unable to take the two-years service men. He (Captain Norton) protested against taking men for such a term of service as would serve neither one purpose nor the other. If short-service men were taken the effect was to improve and strengthen the Reserve, while if long-service men were taken we were not compelled to take such a large number of recruits annually. These nine-years service men would be taken to India, and after serving there for seven years would return to this country without the slightest chance of obtaining civil employment. It had been stated that they would be provided for by non-commissioned rank, but the number retained for non-commissioned officers would be extremely small, and the remainder would go to swell the ranks of the unemployed. It would not be denied that a large proportion of this expenditure had been caused by the fact that at the present moment sufficient of these nine-years men had not been trained to go to India. The result was that there were sent out to India at a cost of £120 each men who on their arrival were absolutely valueless. He knew from personal experience that only a very small proportion of the men were fit to take the field, and he had seen men fall out by the dozen before the hot weather began. There were some 4,000 or 5,000 of these immature men in India, and they were being rapidly invalided and sent home to swell the ranks of the unemployed. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman was not responsible for that, but would he say when he hoped to be able to obtain sufficient nine-years men to supply the necessary drafts for India each year, and how soon he would be able to put his entire scheme into operation. If the right hon. Gentleman could not get the nine-years men the whole scheme would break down. For how long did he think he would succeed in getting the nine-years men who were now presenting themselves? He was practically absorbing for the Indian reliefs the fourteen battalions the reduction of which had been promised, and it was scarcely fair to take advantage of the necessities of the country in such a way that three or four years hence the deficiency would be much greater than at present. It was his firm belief that if the right hon. Gentleman had the free hand which his ability and knowledge deserved, he would take the wise course of enlisting a long-service Army for India, which would give him a greater margin as regarded recruiting, and enable him to build up a Reserve in this country in the event of certain contingencies in India.

One of the difficulties in recruiting was the great objection men had to going to South Africa. The experience of the men who had seen service in South Africa had made that sphere extremely unpopular. Men who had enlisted for three years on the distinct understanding that they would not be sent abroad had been sent to India, and the fear in men's minds was that if they enlisted for two years they might on some pretence be shipped to South Africa; consequently they would not enlist at all. South African service was unpopular for many reasons.

*THE CHAIRMAN asked whether the point the hon. Member was now referring to had anything to do with the Vote. The fact that an addition of half-a-million of money was wanted seemed to indicate that there were more recruits than before.

CAPTAIN NORTON said the Financial Secretary had pointed out that part of the expenditure was in consequence of the War Office having been unable to bring home three regiments from South Africa. That had added largely to the working expenses of the year, and was presumably included in this item.

*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that that would not apply to recruits now being sent out to South Africa.

CAPTAIN NORTON said the extra pay and necessary allowances applied to the troops in South Africa for whom drafts had to be provided, and he was endeavouring to point out that because of the extreme unpopularity of South African service it was impossible to carry out the arrangement which the right hon. Gentleman contemplated. Troops in South Africa had to do a class of work which they were not called upon to do at home. They strongly objected to being sent out and turned into South African policemen because the constabulary had been so greatly reduced. But they objected still more strenuously to being employed by municipalities to do certain fatigue duties, for which they did indeed receive extra pay, but which extra pay was not one-half the amount paid to other men alongside whom they worked. As a matter of fact, South African finances were being relieved at the expense of the finances of this country, and the main point he desired to emphasise in moving this reduction was that the people of Great Britain were being taxed in order to lessen the taxation on the mineowners of South Africa. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head C (Regimental Pay, Extra Pay, and Messing Allowances) be reduced by £100,000."—(*Captain Norton.*)

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that not only had the Estimate all the vices of a Supplementary Estimate, but it had the double vice that there was no financial or warlike reason why it should not have been included in the original Estimates. It represented a miscalculation by the Secretary of State for War, a consequent financial miscalculation on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and therefore a breach of the engagement put forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he presented his whole scheme based on the original Estimates. A touching appeal had been made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to support him in his desire for economy. He was going to vote against this item and the right hon. Gentleman would have an opportunity of citing him as one of the advocates of economy, and as one who was determined to oppose every Supplementary Estimate of this nature. They were told in this Vote that the reduction in the strength of the Army anticipated in the original Estimates had not been realised. Had any of the Secretary for War's military schemes gone wrong? Had the nine-years men not come up to the mark? Whatever the cause it represented a serious miscalculation on the part of the Secretary of State for War. The Chancellor of the Exchequer last year got the House to consent to his new scheme of taxation, and therefore this Supplementary Estimate was a falsification of the Budget. Last year, on the ground of economy, he voted for the Motion of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean to reduce the number of men serving in the Army by 10,000. It was not possible on this occasion to deal with the number of men directly, although he thought that if they had a Supplementary Vote for regimental pay and messing allowance there should be a Supplementary Vote for men. This Vote had never been defended on the grounds of new facts, or a special emergency having arisen, or upon any of the grounds which justified the presentation of Supplementary Estimates. It was most important to affirm, not merely in an academic manner, but by a hard-and-fast vote, the absolute necessity for presenting the whole scheme in the Budget, and this House should reject any Supplementary Estimate which was not justified by some sudden emergency having arisen since the Budget. He should certainly feel it his duty to vote for this reduction.

SIR ROBERT REID said the Committee were indebted to the candour of the Secretary of State for War for the strongest argument in support of this reduction. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had anticipated a reduction, but this could not be realised by reason of the necessity for keeping more troops than he had expected in South Africa. The reason for keeping additional troops there was the reduction which had taken place in the constabulary. It was estimated that 10,000 men would be required for the South African Constabulary, and this was dwelt upon in one of Lieutenant-General Baden-Powell's reports. They were subsequently reduced to 6,000 and then to 5,000 men, and that for financial reasons. The work which used to be done by the constabulary had to be done now by British troops, who would not otherwise be kept there in such large numbers. The War Office was being unfairly saddled with the expenses of these troops, who would not have been kept in South Africa had it not been for the economic necessity of reducing the constabulary. This was not the sole instance in which, indirectly, they were being called upon to provide money because the finances of the Transvaal were not sufficient to pay their way.

MR. MCKENNA said the Secretary of State for War had promised that he would not make any proposals which would not have the effect of making a substantial reduction in the Army Estimates. So far the right hon. Gentleman had carried out the promise by introducing a supplementary Estimate for £400,000 for pay. The right hon. Gentleman anticipated that he would be able to reduce the Army by fourteen battalions of Regulars, but he had failed to do so. It appeared that the recruits for the three years period had come in so abundantly that he had not been able to reduce the Regulars. But although the three-years men had come in so rapidly the men for service in India had not come in and the former had refused to sign on for the longer period; and so they had had to enlist nine-years men for service in India, with the result that they had got a larger Army than was intended. That was a miscalculation, and he submitted that they were justified in recording their judgment upon that miscalculation by voting for the reduction. The Secretary for War had got his recruits, but he ought to have realised that he would not have enough men for service in India, and he should have stopped his recruiting for the three years period earlier. Had he done so he would have been able to reduce the Regulars by fourteen battalions and they would not have had to find this extra money for pay. This Vote was to be met largely out of appropriations-in-aid obtained by the sale of surplus animals and stock in South Africa. That stock was bought not out of revenue but with borrowed money, or in other words, they added to their debt in order to pay for the things which they were now selling. When that stock was sold the money should have been applied to the extinction of the Debt. For these reasons he thought every hon. Member who cared for economy ought not to submit to this Vote being passed.

MR. WHITLEY said he was afraid the House was getting so accustomed to transactions of this kind that hon. Members had ceased to wonder at them. Money which had been raised by loan and afterwards repaid had frequently been applied to revenue. Money was raised by loan during the war to purchase certain stocks, and when those stocks were sold the money had been applied to revenue instead of to the extinction of debt, as it would have been under any other Government. They had been told by the Financial Secretary to the War Office that at least three regiments more were being kept in South Africa than he had anticipated. His impression was that a good many more than three regiments were being kept there for certain reasons. There could be no doubt that British troops were being put to purposes for which this country ought not to be called upon to pay. He could produce from Johannesburg newspapers sufficient incidents occuring in a single week which would show how the soldiers were being employed to suppress riots in compounds, and in bringing back Chinamen who had escaped from those compounds.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Does the hon. Member say that, as a matter of fact, British soldiers are so employed?

Mr. WHITLEY: Do you deny it?

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, I do. [Ministerial cries of "Withdraw."]

Mr. WHITLEY said that these charges had been frequently made and questions had been asked upon this point, but they had not been able to get any information or any denial that British troops were being employed in this way.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Give me one instance.

Mr. WHITLEY said it was reported that on certain occasions the military were called in. Did the right hon. Gentleman deny that the soldiers were being employed for police purposes in the Transvaal? He did not deny it.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, I do.

Mr. WHITLEY said the right hon. Gentleman was giving a denial to what, he understood, was pretty well known. When the Constabulary were reduced from 10,000 to 4,000 the Transvaal wanted to save their own finances. We actually paid at this time last year no less than £1,000,000 as a contribution to the Transvaal revenues in order to enable them to pay off those men, and to reduce the force to that extent. We ought not to be called upon to meet the additional pay of soldiers in South Africa because the Constabulary had been reduced to such an extent that it was necessary to keep extra British troops in that country. It was quite correct, as his hon. friend had said, that the work which the British troops had to do in South Africa was making the service intensely unpopular. If police were required, he thought the best thing the right hon. Gentleman could do was to call on the mineowners to pay for the service which was necessary.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said it would facilitate the discussion of the Vote if the right hon. Gentleman would now give his reply on the question of the £400,000.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he was not proposing to discuss the future policy, which would be discussed with the Estimates of next year; but there were one or two criticisms with which he wanted to deal and some misapprehensions he wished to correct. In the first place, the hon. Member for West Newington seemed to imagine that the service in India was particularly unpopular, but it was a mistake to suppose it was as unpopular as he represented. And with regard to the service in South Africa, so much was being done for the comfort and welfare of the soldiers that he was informed that it was not unpopular now. Special facilities were given for the men to abridge their service and to go into the Reserves, but they would not accept the offer made. Some hon. Members had spoken with regard to the whole question of the excess, and, with regard to the fourteen battalions specifically mentioned by the hon. Member for Oldham it was perfectly true that it was contemplated they would replace them, but it could not be done all at once. It would be idle before they had anything to replace them to take away any units at all. He had been told that he had promised reductions in Army expenditure, but he hoped he should not be condemned until he had had an opportunity of presenting the Estimates to the House. He was confident, however, that the reduction of men was far more valuable than the reduction of units. Both courses saved money, but the latter would put us in a difficulty in finding men to meet the possible demands from India. The hon. Member for Oldham had said he understood that these battalions would be taken away during the year, and it was part of his proposals that they should be replaced by other battalions. The hon. Member for Dumfries said they were keeping troops in South Africa in excess of the number required. There was an element of truth in that. They did keep three cavalry regiments in South Africa after the date they promised to take them back, and this would add very materially to the cost of the Army during that period, but they had more than kept faith by reducing the South African garrison below the figure they promised. They were not able to bring back three cavalry regiments at the actual date anticipated, and the fact that they were delayed had added very largely to the cost of the Army during that period.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: What is the number of men there now?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: 21,000. He denied that the troops were performing any constabulary duties other than those always performed by troops which might be called to aid the civil power; and he declared that the South African garrison was now placed on the exact undertaking given. The hon. Member for King's Lynn said it was absolutely unjustifiable to make any addition to the amount of the pay of the men in the Army without some grave reason. He did not quarrel with that, but his contention was that there had been grave reason. He had acted in this matter not lightly and without regard to the will of the House. He believed he had acted as any other hon. Member in his place would have acted. He had to consider not what was the obligation of a particular Vote. He had had to consider not whether he would do what was most pleasing to himself, but whether the Army was fit for the purposes of war. He found we were in a very great danger in having a costly Army unfit for the emergency of war, and he took the only measure within his power to fit the Army for war. This measure had been successful, but it had entailed some additional cost. The situation was this: They were accumulating battalions of men who were not available in times of peace for furnishing drafts for India and who would be present in far too great numbers if we had been called upon to take part in war. This was not a normal situation, and it was changing for the worse. What was to be done? He had been reproached for not having stopped this surplus recruiting sooner, but it was impossible for him to make any change until he had had some opportunity of laying his proposals before the House. The moment they were able to put the matter before both Houses of Parliament he took steps to stop the three years recruiting. But the inevitable consequence was a temporary increase in the Army. They could not get rid of the three-years men, a great many of whom, in his opinion, were entirely redundant. Consequently the infantry had gone up beyond what he considered necessary, but they would repair this excess, and far more, in a few months, and they would have an exodus from the Army during next year which would be in no sense made up by the additions they proposed to make.

Hon. Members had asked why the excess occurred at the beginning of last year. There was alarm and uncertainty with regard to the international position. The war in the East had just broken out, and no one could doubt that, whenever a great struggle of that kind commenced, a country which had so many interests as our own might possibly be concerned, and they, therefore, thought it necessary to keep up a much larger reserve in South Africa than otherwise would have been the case. The Government thought it necessary to keep up a larger reserve of horses in South Africa, where they could easily be embarked for India, while the crisis lasted. But when the emergency was over the horses were sold. The same reason held good as to transport in South Africa. In the early part of the year it was found to be undesirable to undertake a reduction of transport in South Africa as long as it was uncertain whether they might not have to move transport and units to India or to any other destination. That alarm had passed away, and the original intention had now been carried out in respect of transport and the upkeep of horses in South

Africa. It was perfectly true that in one sense this excess of the three-years service men was the result of miscalculation. He would prefer to say that it was the result of a temporary miscalculation when no correct calculation was possible. In this matter they had to deal with the individual idiosnycrasies of particular men, and no one could forecast twenty-four hours ahead what the action of these men would be. He believed that the officers were quite unable to state up to the last day whether a soldier intended to remain in the service or to go out of it. He thought he had given an explanation of this matter which ought to commend itself to hon. Members. He certainly took exception to the phrase which had been used by the hon. Member for Halifax as to the soldiers in South Africa being used to "round up" the Chinese. He objected to the phrase on behalf of the British soldiers serving in South Africa. British soldiers were not being used to "round up" Chinamen in South Africa; and he considered the use of the phrase so offensive that, speaking on behalf of the British Army, he repudiated it entirely.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he was quite sure that his hon. friend the Member for Halifax never intended to apply the phrase offensively to, or to make any suggestion which reflected in any way on, the British soldier. As there was nothing offensive in asking the question, he was glad to hear the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman that soldiers were not being employed, and would not be employed in future, in that capacity. He did not wish to enter on the large question of Army reorganisation with which the Secretary of State for War had dealt extensively, and at the same time given the Committee some information upon the alterations in the term of service in the Army. He quite understood that it was a matter of urgency to meet a difficulty of the day. The nine years service was a very good corrective to the three years system introduced by the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor, but he predicted that the right hon. Gentleman would have to revert to a seven years term in the Army and five in the Reserve. The statement of the right hon. Gentleman, however, was the first indication which had been given that his scheme of last session was not being carried forward. In that statement the right hon. Gentleman had used very strong language in regard to the necessity of making economies in money, and reductions not merely in the numbers but the units of the Army. But in the statement now offered by the right hon. Gentleman there was neither economy of money nor economy of numbers foreshadowed. The right hon. Gentlemen had made the keystone of his Army policy of reform a reduction of fourteen battalions in the infantry, while creating a number of inferior battalions which were to be improvised out of the Militia, and for which the Militia was to be sacrificed and destroyed. The fourteen battalions had not been disbanded, and the Militia battalions were not being put upon a Regular footing. The right hon. Gentleman now came forward with a different plan, which was to make the Militia liable for foreign service. He pressed the right hon. Gentleman to say whether the forthcoming Estimates included the reduction of these fourteen battalions. Surely that was a very important point, and the Committee would be very glad of the information that the economies which the right hon. Gentleman promised the House of Commons last year in numbers and units were to be made in the Estimates to be presented to Parliament in a week or so.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he would rather answer that question on the Estimates.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said the right hon. Gentleman must be now in possession of the information.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that was quite true, but he would like to present his Estimates as a whole.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said they could only judge by what they now saw, and the economies which the right hon. Gentleman promised had not been carried out. He regretted to hear from the right hon. Gentleman that he thought the reduction of men was more important than the reduction of units. One of the great complaints had been regarding the great number of units which had not been properly filled up. An inefficient battalion, a squeezed-lemon battalion, or a weak battalion cost nearly as much to maintain as regarded high officers and barracks, band, and other things as a highly efficient battalion at full strength. A large number of weak units cost more than a small number of strong units containing the same number of men. He regretted, therefore, that the right hon Gentleman had not found it possible to face a reduction in the number of units. The practice of making a large quantity of paper *cadres*, to fill which the men were not available, had been a most fertile source of waste. The question of reducing the number of units was a matter of high policy. He was quite certain the Secretary of State would not be able to effect a reduction unless he had great backing behind him. The moment the right hon. Gentleman tried to abolish battalions, to collect mess plate, and to distribute officers among other regiments of the Army, he would encounter tremendous resistance; but until he did that, all his high aspirations and paper plans for reconstruction were really not of any serious importance. It would be easy for the right hon. Gentleman to reduce the number of men in the Army by a healthy process of inquiring into characters more rigidly and by taking recruits of greater height and chest measurement. By stiffening the standard and making the requirements of the soldier more exacting the number of men would automatically diminish. Therefore it was not quite accurate to say that the number of men had risen automatically, simply because there was a change in the conditions of recruiting. He was bound to say that the hon. Gentleman who moved the reduction was thoroughly justified. There was a great possibility of economy in men and units; and if the right hon. Gentleman had obtained the reduction he had at heart he would only be too glad to inform the Committee. Under the circumstances he did not see why this large sum should be voted without offering any resistance to it.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he was not at all sure in his mind whether the British soldier in South Africa was doing police work. The Secretary of State said it was offensive to say that. No offence was intended. How often were the troops called in? Were they called in so often as to make the condition normal? The constabulary had been reduced from 10,000 to 6,000. Ten thousand was not too many from what they heard of the state of affairs on the Rand; and it appeared as if the soldiers were being called in to make up the deficiency in the police which the Rand magnates would not pay for.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER asked the right hon. Gentleman how many troops there were on the Rand.

DR. MACNAMARA said he was not Secretary of State for War. The constabulary had been reduced and the troops had to be called in more frequently than before. That was for the purpose of economy and was a scandal. It was bad enough to have the shadow of the compounds falling across the bones of dead British soldiers on the veldt, but it was worse to have other British soldiers doing this dirty work because it was cheap.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Will the hon. Member tell me whether there are any British soldiers on the Rand?

*DR. MACNAMARA: Certainly.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: He is aware that there are?

*DR. MACNAMARA: Certainly.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir; he is wrong.

*DR. MACNAMARA: Are there any British soldiers in Pretoria?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER assented.

*DR. MACNAMARA said that the constabulary had been reduced for purposes of economy. As the son of a private soldier himself, he protested against British soldiers being called on to do this dirty work on the cheap. The private soldier

Field, William
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N Dorset
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Captain Norton and Mr. Ainsworth.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs

Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson,Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, MajEvans-(Tr'H'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Harshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Mar. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,SirJames(Staffords. NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, Hn. H.L.W.(MileEnd
Lawson, John Grant(YorksNR
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hn. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.JH(Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn.Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, HonArthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt.Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliam H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt.HnE.R.(Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. McKENNA moved a reduction of £100 on Item D, "Army Deferred Pay" revised Estimate, £146,000. He thought the Committee would agree that this was a case in which a reduction should be made. Deferred pay, as he understood, had been abolished, but of course there were still persons on the deferred pay system. What the Committee would expect in such a case was that the original Estimate would show the exact amount for which we had become liable. The Financial Secretary knew the number of men at the beginning of the year who would come upon him for deferred pay. Such a large divergence as 15 per cent. between the original Estimate and the revised Estimate showed that the original Estimate was not drawn up with care. The House of Commons had deprecated again and again the system of introducing Supplementary Estimates upon matters which ought to have been properly estimated at the beginning of the year. The Committee were justified in making a protest against what on the face of it was carelessness in getting up the Vote.

money which he had earned. Another thing he could not understand was why this system of deferred pay was still in force. It was introduced with the idea that it would assist in recruiting, and that at the end of his service the soldier would receive a substantial sum to help him to start in civil life. The experiment was not very successful because the soldier found himself in possession of a considerable sum, which he generally got rid of in a very short time, and the object for which the money was really saved, namely, to enable the soldier to tide over the time between his leaving the Army and getting employment, was not served. A plan was then adopted whereby a soldier's money was sent to his home for him, instead of being placed in his hands, and thus subjecting him to the temptation of being led away by bad characters outside the barracks. That scheme did not have a much better effect. There was now a different scheme altogether, and he certainly thought that the Committee should have some explanation from the Secretary of State as to why this item of deferred pay appeared on the Estimates year after year, and why this year he should have asked for an increased amount. He had no desire to detain the Committee, but he was an old soldier himself, and he thought that on military questions it was desirable that old soldiers thould be heard.

*MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said he was not sure that he understood the argument of the hon. Member who moved the reduction of the Vote; but it appeared to him it meant the repudiation of the liability of the country to pay £10,000 of deferred pay which was owing to the soldiers in India. He could not understand how those hon. Members opposite who shortly expected to appeal to the country could make such an attempt to deprive our unfortunate soldiers of the pay due to them. It might be that the system of deferred pay was bad for the Army, but that was not a question they had anything to do with that evening. He could imagine any Member moving the reduction of the Vote by £100 which provided arms, horses, or even clothing for the soldiers, because the hon. Member might imagine that the soldiers could do with so much less of these, provided they did not go too far in reducing the clothing. He insisted that if this deferred pay to the soldiers was refused it would at once increase the number of unemployed. Complaint had been made by hon. Gentlemen on the other side as to a mistake of £10,000 in the Indian accounts. When they remembered that the different depots in India were, many of them, hundreds and even thousands of miles apart, it was not surprising that some of the deferred pay accounts had not been made up owing to the carelessness of some officers. They did not expect the highest efficiency from some officers—[Loud OPPOSITION cries of "Name"]—he meant that they did not look for the highest state of efficiency in regard to accounts from some officers. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh!"] For the reasons he had mentioned he should certainly vote against the reduction, and he hoped the whole House would do so.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) said that there was one observation of his hon. friend who had just sat down that appeared to him to have been misunderstood. His hon. friend did not say that they should not look to officers for correct accounts, as one would suppose from the derisive cheers of hon. Gentlemen opposite, at any rate his hon. friend did not mean that the accounts were not correct in themselves. What he meant was that, after all, an officer was not a booking clerk; although from what he had heard from friends of his own who were colonels in the Army they were little better than booking clerks, considering the number of accounts they had to keep. [AN HON. MEMBER on the IRISH BENCHES: Sit down; your majority has arrived now.] Item D of the Vote, "Army Deferred Pay," really consisted of two items, one of £90,000 for the British establishment, and the other of £43,000 for the Indian establishment. The Army Service Corps, the Royal Medical Corps, and the Colonial and Indian Stores Department were not included in the original Estimates, and therefore it was exceedingly likely that the £10,000 mistake was due to the Indian establishment and not to the English officials. He did not think it was the wisest way to recoup the soldiers for depriving them of deferred pay by increasing their daily pay. He had known soldiers who had come home with money in their pockets and had immediately wasted it upon the spot. [Opposition cries of "Oh, oh!"] He did not say that they had absolutely squandered it, but had invested it at once in some small business without careful inquiry. While he thought that the deferred pay system was not a good one, yet when it was abolished it would have been much better to have given something in the way not of an old-age pension, but of a small pension after the term of service had ended. An obviously capital way of getting out of the difficulty in regard to recruiting for the Army was to increase the pensions. [At this point the right hon. Gentleman he Secretary of State for War entered the Chamber.] He was glad that his right hon. friend had come in and he would conclude.

Colonel PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said he was rather surprised that derogatory remarks had been made about officers who did not understand the principles of arithmetic.

Mr. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said he could not see what the principles of arithmetic had to do with this Vote.

*The CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member was replying to some aspersions which had been cast on certain officers.

Colonel PILKINGTON said that as regarded this mistake of £10,000 he had heard of a Chancellor of the Exchequer who had suddenly found himself placed in that high position, and who, when certain statistics in decimals were put before him by his officials, asked what the black dots meant. [Opposition cries of "Name."] Hon. Gentlemen opposite were so intelligent that he should have thought they would have been in the position of Joseph when asked by Pharoah to interpret his dream. If hon. Gentlemen opposite, who were supposed to have a monopoly of wisdom, did not know who that Chancellor of the Exchequer was they were not worthy to sit on those benches.

*The CHAIRMAN invited the hon. and gallant Member to confine himself to the question before the Committee.

Colonel PILKINGTON said he was only trying to defend the officers who had been attacked, and to show that they were not so very far behind in their arithmetic. As to deferred pay, he thought it was one of the very best things ever invented. Why should hon. Members opposite try to rob the soldiers of their hard-earned wages? They had served their country well and faithfully while hon. Gentlemen opposite refused to go out to the Boer War. Was it not absurd, considering the existing condition of unemployment, and after all that had been said about employers of labour not engaging old soldiers, to attempt to deprive them of their deferred pay? They ought to have every chance in life after the sacrifices they had made, and why, then, rob them of their deferred pay?

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 153; Noes, 179. (Division List No. 20.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allen Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsay(Galw'y
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick

Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H.(Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Johnson, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (T'pper'ry Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.CR.(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Ratcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (NDorset
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.Sir H
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt. Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour,RtHn GeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar,SirT.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon.Sir JohnE.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke,Rt.Hon.Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ(Manch'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,SirR.B(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Godson,Sir AugustusFrederick
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,SirJames(Staffords. NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,Sir A.(Stafford, W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier,Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn.Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General

Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N R
Lee,Arthur H(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol,S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,W.JH(Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel,Hn. Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, Sir Harry S(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles GE. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved to report Progress. He did so, he said, in order to call attention to the spectacle—as he thought, the very disgraceful spectacle—which the House of Commons had witnessed during the last hour, and for which he was prepared to suggest and to prove that the Government was primarily responsible. [AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the Prime Minister?] What had been the course of events that day? This was the first working day of the session and they were engaged on the Supplementary Estimates. The Financial Secretary to the War Office, in introducing them, delivered a very lengthy speech, which was contrary to precedent, for a very obvious reason. [Cheers and MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] It was perfectly palpable that he went out of his way to expand every little detail. [The PRIME MINISTER entered the House.] He was very glad to see that in a matter which pertained to the Estimates they had for the first time the presence of the First Lord of the Treasury. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] They were entitled when Supply was before the House to ask that the chief official of the Treasury should be present and more especially when things were going on which the Prime Minister knew in every detail, he being primarily the man to whom the dignity and honour of the House was charged. But he was very diplomatically absent. What was the course taken? The Financial Secretary to the War Office made a lengthy appeal to them for short speeches. An hon. friend of his moved an Amendment in a very brief speech, but the debate was prolonged for something like an hour by hon. Members opposite, who had really no criticisms to offer. [Cheers and cries of "Oh!] If they had why did they not support them in the Lobby? The debate was prolonged for something like an hour. The Chief Whip of the Government kept ostentatiously walking into the House and passing the word round. He was in command of the reserves and organised all this obstruction to the work of the House of Commons. At seven o'clock there was a division [Several HON. MEMBERS: A quarter past], and immediately afterwards a reduction was moved. That division was taken after a debate, which he did not think anybody would say was a prolonged one, upon an important matter involving the expenditure of £400,000. The Opposition were prepared to take a division before half-past seven, but the hon. Member for Peckham—he agreed that the hon. Baronet had earned the gratitude of hon. Members opposite; he was the colonel of the Old Guard—the hon. Member talked the Motion out. He did not think the hon. Baronet would deny that suggestion. Immediately after dinner the same process began again. The test of the sincerity of the utterances of hon. Members opposite was that the Secretary for War never got up to answer them because he knew they were not addressed in good faith. [Cheers and MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] The object was not to get an answer, but simply to waste time. The Prime Minister knew perfectly well that the House of Commons was absolutely tired of him and his Ministry. That night they all came down for the purpose of these skirmishes as a sort of detaining force until the rest of the army came up. It was true that they came up in rather larger numbers that night than usual. There were three vacancies in the Ministry, and they were looking for deferred pay. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Divide."] He submitted that this was humiliating to the House of Commons, and that to carry on proceedings such as those they had witnessed during the past hour was inflicting a deep blow on its dignity and efficiency, and he ventured to move to report Progress in order to call attention to it.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*).

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.). Sir, I understand that the hon. Gentleman has risen with a double motive. One is to safeguard the dignity of the House, and the other is to expedite business. I cannot say that in either of those most laudable objects he appears to me to have attained any great success. The hon. Gentleman, in the course of his speech, levelled a taunt at this side of the House which I certainly thought unworthy of him, and which I did not think added to the dignity of the House. He told the House in the earlier portion of his oration that the House was tired both of me and of the Government. That may be so. There are very simple methods of establishing the fact, and if we be a nuisance the nuisance is easily abated. The hon. Gentleman suggested that it is not with the view of supporting the Government on principle that my hon. friends have come down, but with some desire for office—that it was some desire to fill the vacant places in the Government that animated the Gentlemen whom I see around me. I do not think it is wise that taunts of this sort should be put forward across the floor of the House. There may be, I am told by the vast school of prophets I see opposite to me, an immediate chance of another Government being formed other than the one sitting on this bench. There will be more than three places to dispose of when that time comes, and I do not know whether we are to follow the example set by the hon. Gentleman and attribute any of the feverish activity we see on that side to a desire to form part of another Ministry. For my part, I do not think that these questions are very profitable matters for discussion, and I should certainly not have named them had the hon. Gentleman not thought fit to begin that particular game of repartee in which I am always very pleased to meet him, although I do not pretend to compete with equal strength.

The hon. Gentleman gave a picture of this afternoon's and evening's proceedings which my friends near me tell me does not correspond with the facts; and he reproaches me with not having been here myself to be an eye-witness and to bear first-hand testimony to the matters in debate. There are many younger and less experienced Members than he, but all may know, or ought to know, that it is quite impossible for the First Lord of the Treasury to sit here during all the debates in Supply. It is neither customary, nor is it possible. Nor could the business of the country be carried on if that were the practice. I make not the smallest apology for not having been here during all the afternoon; indeed, if I am to accept the hon. Gentleman's testimony to the value of the speeches delivered on this side of the House, and the testimony of my hon. friends to the value of the speeches delivered on that side, I do not think I can have lost much by my non-attendance. What is the real gravamen of the charge of the hon. Gentleman? He wraps it up in a great many fine phrases about the dignity of the House. I would put it in two words. Hon. Gentlemen opposite wanted to have a snap division. Now, Sir, I am not quarrelling with the benevolent desire of the hon. Gentleman opposite to have a snap division. Doubtless he thinks he would thereby reap much benefit for himself and his Party. He is at liberty to pursue legitimate ends by means not contrary to the Rules and Orders of the House; but if he is at liberty to aim at getting a snap division, we are at least as much at liberty to do what we can to prevent it. And I will tell the House why. After all, the object of taking a division at all is to obtain the best reflection you can of the opinions of the representatives of the people—the Members of this House. How is that best attained? By so manœuvring as to obtain a snap division, or by taking a division when the House of Commons is comparatively full? The question has only to be put to be answered. I hope the hon. Gentleman, whose Parliamentary talents I admire, will not suppose I am attacking him for endeavouring to make use of every device which the Rules of the House permit to embarrass those to whom he is opposed. My Parliamentary career is now rather a long one, and I certainly am not going to stand up and say I have never adopted the same course, and attempted to reap what small and petty advantages can be obtained by such an expedient. But to get up as the hon. Member has done, and in tones of thunderous indignation to indicate that the constitution of the House is being shattered and the dignity of its proceedings destroyed simply because we meet his manœuvre by another, and, I venture to say, a more legitimate one, is—I do not wish to be offensive—playing with words. It is to indulge in a speech of parade, the true meaning of which every one in this House understands. It is not intended to convince hon. Members, and if it is to be consumed at all it is by other audiences elsewhere. I am bound to say this Motion to report Progress is exceedingly ill-timed, and no good purpose is served by it. The hon. Gentleman has mourned over the waste of time that has already taken place upon what he rather unkindly calls the first working day of the session, and I hope he will now support the Government in the attempt to carry on business.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman has excused himself for not being present during the last hour, and I make the admission at once that it is not to be expected that the Prime Minister will always be in his place; but I think the Prime Minister will admit on his part that we have never had a Leader of the House who has so habitually absented himself during our proceedings. [Cries of "Oh, oh!" "No," "Hear, hear!" and "Withdraw."] As an instance, I will go no further back than yesterday. We then had an Amendment to the Address brought forward, not directed against any mere departmental administration with which the Minister for the Department might deal, but which was an arraignment of the general financial policy of the Government, and throughout that debate, from first to last, the right hon. Gentleman was only here for a few minutes while the Chancellor of the Exchequer was speaking.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There were very good reasons for my absence yesterday, but, in addition to the claims of public business, it was understood that by arrangement the debate should close at half-past seven o'clock. I consulted with the Minister whose particular business it was—the Chancellor of the Exchequer—and it was not considered necessary that two Ministers should address the House; but had the debate extended through the evening I would have taken my part in it

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I did not refer to the right hon. Gentleman not speaking in the debate; I referred to the fact of his being absent. He did not listen to one of the speeches made against the financial policy of his Government. The right hon. Gentleman says he has lost nothing by his absence this evening. Well, he has lost one thing, because I am quite sure if he had been present he would not have made the speech he has just now made. He attributes to us a manœuvre. I can only say for my part—and I ought to know something about the business of the House—that if there was a manœuvre I had no knowledge whatever of it. But I leave the right hon. Gentleman the benefit of his imputed manœuvre, and ask what is the business of the Government? It is to have their supporters here at the hours they have themselves fixed, and then they would be proof against any manœuvre. But what we saw was Member after Member from that side of the House get up and unblushingly occupy time without any attempt at concealment. There was no concealment about it, every one of them spoke with his tongue in his cheek. and I am afraid some of them must have bitten their tongues in the process. It was the business of the supporters of the Government to be here in sufficient numbers. The Amendment which was before us was talked out by supporters of the Government. There might have been a division at half-past seven, I am told—I was away myself, which in itself shows the absence of any manœuvre—there might have been a division if it had not been for the action of the hon. Member for Peckham. The same course was pursued at nine o'clock and continued until ten minutes to ten. The Government will be appealing to us by-and-by for some indulgence on account of pressure of time for proceeding with their business, and now, by flagrant neglect of their duty and by pushing to an indecent extreme the forms of the House, they have wasted nearly an hour, and they have done this in an evident and exuberantly willing manner, their supporters seeming to think it was a great joke to play these tricks with time. The present Motion is a proper one, and I hope it will be carried to a division.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said as he was present he wished to put on record his impression of the debate the right hon. Gentleman did not hear.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot say I was here the whole time. I was not here until shortly after nine.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he would remind the House what the debate had been. At twenty minutes past seven an Amendment was moved for the purpose of depriving the soldiers of £10,000 worth of the property they had earned. That money was as much the soldiers' property as anything hon. Gentlemen opposite had in their pockets was their property. If there was an illegitimate proceeding in the House that night it was moving an Amendment which, on the face of it, was illusory and absurd. As to the absence or presence of the Prime Minister, if the time ever came when the Leader of the Opposition might be able to set them an example, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would stick to the rule he had laid down and always be present during all the debates. He could not imagine a greater sustenance to the Party to which he (the speaker) belonged than to hear a bad case so ill-sustained as the right hon. Gentleman had that night sustained the case of the Opposition.

MR. McKENNA said that he also had been present throughout the debate, and it was his Amendment upon which the discussion had arisen. The right hon. Gentleman had, unintentionally, grossly misdescribed that Amendment, which was not one to deprive the soldier of £10,000. It was three times read from the Chair to be a reduction of £100. [Cries of, "Withdraw."] Oh, they would never withdraw. That Amendment was moved, not on the ground of desiring to withdraw from any soldier any deferred pay, but, as he explained in moving, and as the right hon. Gentleman was aware, because no such error should have been made in the accounts as would require an additional Estimate of £10,000. It was on that account he moved a reduction so small that it would not have affected the pay of a single soldier by a farthing. He could assure the Prime Minister that the picture drawn of the debate by the mover of the adjournment was strictly accurate; he would go further and say that the Prime Minister knew it was correct, otherwise why did the right hon. Gentleman defend in the second half of his speech what he described as a manœuvre on the part of his followers ? There had been no manœuvre to get a snap division. But he would tell the right hon. Gentleman what there had been. There had been an earnest desire on the part of hon. Members on his side to attend to the business of the House. There had been an earnest desire also on the part of the right hon. Gentleman's Whips to make his followers attend to the business of the House, but they had refused to do so. They were in a state of rebellion which the right hon. Gentleman considered a condition precedent to an appeal to the country, and on the first working day of the session the House had had an example of how a worn-out Government had lost all authority, not only in the country, but amongst their own followers. If the right hon. Gentleman retained any regard for the reputation and honour of the House he would not endeavour to protract a struggle which must inevitably end in defeat.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 167; Noes, 191. (Division List No. 21.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, C. R. (Galway)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellice,Capt.EC(S.Andrew'sBhs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, A. (Lanark, N.E.)
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter,Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John
Jones Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,VincentP.(Cavan,W)
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal,W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid(Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(RoscommonN
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, JohnE.(Waterford)
Reid, SirR.Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.HnC.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters(N.Dorset
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,SirJ T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. M'Kenna.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,RtHn.SirH.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bill, Charles
Bingham Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell,J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos.H.A.E.
Collings, Rt Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar,SirT.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington,RtHon.Sir John E.
Doughty Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Dyke, Rt.Hon.Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Ferguson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,SirR.B.(Invern'ssB'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick,SW
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen,Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marqof(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Howard, J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kenyon-Slaney,RtHon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson,Hn. H.L.W. (MileEnd)
Lawson, John G (Yorks. N. R.)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmo'th
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,W.JH.(Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J.Scott(Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Robertson, Herbert(Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel,SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon.A.(Ormskirk)
Stanley, Rt. Hon.Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, RtHn.SirWm.H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts).
Wharton, Rt. Hn. J. Lloyd
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

* SIR A. HAYTER asked for an explanation of the increase of no less than 12 per cent. under Sub-head E. The items were all of a very ordinary character, in regard to which one would have thought approximately correct Estimates could have been made.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) complained of so large an increase in the Estimates. They were supposed to be going in for economy, but here was most extravagant expenditure. As representing a constituency where money was badly needed, he strongly protested against the extra expenditure of £15,150. It was a matter on which he could easily make a fifty minutes speech, but, in deference to the wishes of the Prime Minister, he would simply move the reduction of the Vote by that amount, and ask for an explanation.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head E (Regimental Allowances and Expenses) be reduced by £15,150."—(*Mr. Weir.*)

MR. JOSEPH WALTON said that in view of the assurances given by the Secretary of State last year that strenuous efforts would be made to reduce expenditure it was very disappointing to find increases in all these items. This Vote was in respect of matters in regard to which one could not help feeling it was perfectly possible to have effected considerable reductions, and the Committee ought to have some fuller explanation of how the increase was made up, and as to why there was any increase at all. The people were over-taxed for the Army; the whole country was groaning under the burden of taxation; and in the face of the financial position of the country it was the duty of the Committee to insist on the fullest examination of every Estimate, whether original or supplemental, with a view to securing reductions wherever possible.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said this Vote was not quite so simple as the right hon. Baronet seemed to think. Many of the items had been in existence only a few years, and the sole basis upon which Estimates could be framed was past experience. The war had created new conditions and new allowances, with the result that the old system of estimating could no longer be relied upon; therefore the War Office had started a new system. All the old landmarks had been swept away, and it would probably be a few years before the Estimates could be framed with perfect accuracy. In this case there had undoubtedly been a serious under-estimate, but it was due to the circumstances he had mentioned.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 164; Noes, 192. (Division List No. 22.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce. Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galw'y
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellice, Capt E C (SAndrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred

Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,Sir Francis H(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander(LanarkNE
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, RtHn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt.Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr.CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O’Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid
O’Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O’Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O’Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O’Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O’Dowd, John
O’Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
O’Malley, William
O’Mara, James
O’Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn.C.R(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tenant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thos. Palmer
Wills, A. Walters (Dorset., N.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,Sir JT(Hud’ersfi’ld
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Weir and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn.Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.HonSirH.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J. (Manch’r.
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, JH.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C.W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir HoratioD (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar,Sir T.R (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. SirJoseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt Hn.Sir J.(Mancr.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, SirR.B(Inv’rn’ss Bghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir AugustusFrederick
Gordon, Hn.J.E(Elgin&Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon.George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall

Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'donderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John(KentFaversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James HenryCecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn.Col. W.
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lawson,JohnGrant (Yorks.N.R
Lee, Arthur H (Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie, Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, WJH(Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt.HnSirFrederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J.Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, Sir HarryS (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt.Hn.Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt.Hn. SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.CE.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. JohnLloyd
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R(Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. O'MARA pointed out that there was an excess upon this Vote of £25,000 and he wished to move its reduction by £5,000. If the Secretary for War favoured him with a reply he hoped he would not deliberately misinterpret the motives which had led him to make this Motion. This excess might be due to civilians, and he did not move this reduction for the purpose of asking the Committee to repudiate debts which were due to those civilians. Upon a similar Motion the right hon. Gentleman had accused the Opposition of trying to deprive the soldiers of £10,000, but he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would not misinterpret his motives in that way. He moved this Motion because he was convinced that there had been great carelessness in the preparation of these Estimates and in the way in which they had been placed before the House. This was by no means the first time that he had risen to protest against the manner in which these Votes had been presented to the House. He was reluctant to move this Motion, because he noticed that some of the money was for the doctors of the Army, but he wished more particularly to know if it were a fact that grooms and officers' servants were paid out of this money. Was it true that the country had to pay for these services. He had no wish to unduly occupy the time of the House, but he wished to have a distinct answer to those questions. Unless he obtained a satisfactory reply he should be obliged to press his Motion to a division. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head I (Wages of Civilians attached to Units, etc.) be reduced by £5,000."—(*Mr. O'Mara.*)

MR. JOSEPH WALTON said it ought to have been possible to employ soldiers in place of many of the civilians who were engaged in quasi-regimental duties. Instead of spending this money upon civilians he thought it would have been much better expended upon guns and rifles. The Committee ought not to pass this Vote without some satisfactory explanation from the Secretary of State for War as to why this large increase in the expenditure had taken place in time of peace.

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT explained that the whole cost was accounted for by the fact that in South Africa during the greater part of the year they had had to maintain a very large number, an excessive number, of horses and transport animals. He had done his best to keep down expenditure, but he did not feel justified in insisting upon economy when it was opposed to the requirements of the service. It was felt that in the event of war those transport animals would be required. Of course those animals had to be taken care of by civilian servants, and this expenditure had been incurred mostly for civilian servants, such as grasscutters, labourers, and persons attending to the horses. Soldiers were not employed because the animals were in the Remount Department, in which there was not a sufficient number of soldiers to take charge of them.

*MR. McCRAE asked for a more detailed explanation.

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: It is the whole of the explanation.

*MR. McCRAE: Then it is a very poor explanation. They certainly ought to have a more detailed explanation than the mere statement that this expenditure was necessary because the Secretary for War was afraid of a war in the Far East.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.) said they had just been told that the state of affairs in the Far East necessitated this large increase in the forces in South Africa. The increase was out of all proportion to the original Estimate. The Financial Secretary had told them that it was due to the maintenance of transport animals and fodder, but there would have to be a very large number of horses indeed to account for the great increase. He did not think the explanation given was at all satisfactory.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) pressed for some further explanation. The explanation given was a most surprising one, for it was to the effect that the military authorities thought that we were going to drift into war, which was disquieting.

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: I did not say that. What I stated was that, in the view of the military authorities, it would not have been wise or prudent if they had not retained those transport animals.

MR. LOUGH said that showed that the military authorities thought there was a danger of drifting into war. What was the war they were contemplating? If there was any real danger of war the spending of an extra £25,000 upon men cutting grass for ponies would be no use. This was the most grotesque explanation he had ever heard. He wished to know what number of animals were being kept in readiness for this imaginary war. What Power was it that they were likely to go to war with? The hon. Member ought to give them some further information upon this point, and more particularly he ought to tell them whether the danger was now past.

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said he was not entitled to speak on the question whether there was at present any danger of war. But these horses had now been sold, and the men discharged, and these payments no longer continued. Therefore, the hon. Member need not be disquieted in his mind.

MR. DALZIEL thought the raising of this question had been fully justified by the further remarks of the Financial Secretary to the War Office. Judging from the statement he had made he had come to the conclusion that in order to get at the real inner mind of the Government they had to go to the junior members of the Administration. The hon. Member had put forward a reason which, with all due respect to him, he confessed he could not quite understand, and he could not see how it could be the real reason for this extra expenditure. He said that it was due to the fears of the military authorities that this increase in the Estimate had taken place. He thought this was a case in which they ought to have a word from the Secretary for War in justification of such an important departure. The hon. Gentleman himself within the last few minutes explained and defended this Vote on the ground of what was in the mind of the military authorities as to what might transpire in the Far East. The Committee, therefore, were amply justified in asking further information in regard to that statement. What were the fears present to the mind of the military authorities, and who were the military authorities who came to that decision? Was it the late Secretary for War, or was it the present Secretary? Was it the combined intelligence of the whole of the War Office known as the Army Council? The hon. Gentleman could not get away from the statement he had made, and he ought to tell the Committee what was feared and what rendered this increased expenditure necessary.

*SIR A. HAYTER asked whether it would not be possible to put this item in a more intelligible form. He was wholly incapable of construing it. It turned out that the expense was for grass-cutters. He wanted to know for what time they were employed and how it was possible to spend that amount on them.

*MR. McCRAE asked for some details in regard to the work done by civilians attached to units. The revised Estimate amounted to £75,000, being an addition of 50 per cent. on the original Estimate. If the increase had not been spent on wages alone what was the other expenditure?

CAPTAIN NORTON said they were led to understand that the increase was for wages of Kaffir grass-cutters and of certain whites who had charge of the transport animals. The Committee were entitled to know the amount of transport so retained, and also why it was retained. What was the presumption as to the amount of this transport that could be utilised in the Far East? Was the staff in charge of the animals also to be taken to the Far East, although better and cheaper labour for that work could be obtained in India? This charge of £75,000 did not represent the whole of the expenditure, because there was also a charge for forage and so forth for these animals. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would explain what the dangers in the Far East were.

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said that the Supplementary Estimate represented what was paid for services of civilians attached to units. It might be that there was a good deal to be said on both sides of the question as to whether civilians should be employed in certain work in connection with the Army, but they were employed with the view of the increased efficiency of the soldiers. If they wished to get the best service out of the soldier he should not be asked to perform all kinds of civil duties. He could not at the moment enter into the considerations in regard to the Far East which led the Government to think that it would not be prudent to sell the animals they had in their possession. The necessity had now entirely passed away. The maintenance of horses in South Africa was enormously expensive, and everybody knew it was a fact that it took only a few months for a horse to perform the extraordinary feat of eating its own head off.

*MR. McCRAE: That is very interesting, but it does not answer the question whether it was for wages or not. Was it all for wages ?

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: Yes.

MR. WEIR said if the Committee were furnished with more information in the Estimates it would not be necessary to ask these questions at the cost of a vast amount of valuable time. After the explanation that had been given as to the payment of £25,000 for grass-cutters he was in as great a maze as ever. What were the difficulties in the Far East to which the hon. Gentleman had referred ? He was prepared to support the Government when money was prudently and wisely expended, but he was afraid that in this instance there had been a want of wisdom. He, for one, objected to the Estimates being thrown at their heads in this unsatisfactory fashion.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 172; Noes, 198. (Division List No. 23.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt EC (S. Andrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Marnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Carles Benjamin
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills,ArthurWalters (N.Dorset
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Hudd'rsfi'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Mooney.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour,RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell,J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. W.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies,Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke,Rt.Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,Sir R.B(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir AugustusFrederick
Gordon, Hn.J.E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'donderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt Hon Col. W.
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut -General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson,Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R.
Lee,Arthur H(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Milner,Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G Stopford
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon W F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

THE ADMINISTRATION.

On the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) asked the Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury whether he had any information to give the House as to the reported resignation of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and the reported intended resignation of the Lord-Lieutenant. It was important that the House should be informed of these impending changes, especially at a time when the political situation was so critical, because for that very reason it was doubtful whether the Government had the right to make great appointments abroad which might have the effect of prejudicing the future very gravely and of carrying colonial and foreign affairs into extremely controversial regions. It was most important that the House should have the earliest information of the impending reconstruction, for the twelfth or fourteenth time, of the Cabinet.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) said that any question as to the reconstruction of the Government should obviously be put to the First Lord of the Treasury. With regard to the other question, he had to say that there was no truth whatever in the report that either the Lord-Lieutenant or the Chief Secretary had tendered his resignation.

COAL EXPORTS, ETC.

Return ordered, "giving, for the year 1904, the export of Coal from each Port in the United Kingdom to each Country Abroad, together with summary statements showing the export of Coal in every period of three months from the principal districts of the United Kingdom to the principal groups of Foreign Countries; and also showing the quantity of Coal shipped at each Port in the United Kingdom for ships' use on Foreign voyages during like periods (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 96, of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. D. A. Thomas.*)

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 3rd March, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—North British Railway (General Powers).

Also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—Great Central Railway [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) [H.L.]; Shepton Mallet Gas Company (Electric Lighting) [H.L.].

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Marylebone Chapels Bill [H.L.]. Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Hastings Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]; Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill; Heckmondwike Improvement Bill; Hammersmith, City, and North-East London Railway Bill; Wigan Corporation Bill. Examiners' Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next.

Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.]; Bridgewater Canals Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]; Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [H.L.]; County of London Electric Supply Company Bill [H.L.]; Mexborough and Swinton Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 445. Leeward Islands (Report for 1903–1904).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND).

Returns of the Official Assignees of the King's Bench Division "in Bankruptcy," in Ireland, and of the Local Courts, Belfast and Cork, for the year 1904.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.] (No. 18.)

A Bill to amend the Married Women's Property Act, 1882; And

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.] (No. 19.)

A Bill for the better prevention of corruption.

Were presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1^{a}; and to be printed.

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Committee have nominated the following Lords to serve on the Standing Committee:

L. Archbp. of Canterbury.
E. Halsbury. (*L. Chancellor.*)
L. Archbp. of York.
E. Vane. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
M. Salisbury. (*L. Privy Seal.*)
D. Bedford.
D. Devonshire.
D. Northumberland.
M. Winchester.
M. Lansdowne.
M. Linlithgow.
M. Bath.

E. Clarendon.
(*L. Chamberlain.*)
E. Derby.
E. Denbigh.
E. Stamford.
E. Chesterfield.
E. Jersey.
E. Lauderdale.
E. Carnwath.
E. Stanhope.
E. Waldegrave.
E. Portsmouth.
E. Spencer.
E. Malmesbury.
E. Westmeath.
E. Belmore.
E. Onslow.
E. Minto.
E. Stradbroke.
E. Cawdor.
E. Camperdown.
E. Lichfield.
E. Yarborough.
E. Dartrey.
E. Lytton.
E. Ancaster.
E. Crewe.
V. Falkland.
V. Sidmouth.
V. Gordon.
(*E. Aberdeen.*)
V. Hutchinson.
(*E. Donoughmore.*)
V. Hampden.
V. Cross.
V. Knutsford.
V. Llandaff.
V. Goschen.
V. Ridley.
V. Churchill.
L. Bp. London.
L. Bp. Hereford.
L. Bp. Rochester.
L. Zouche of Haryngworth.
L. Windsor.
L. Clifford of Chudleigh.
L. Barnard.
L. Saltoun.
L. Balfour.
L. Monson.
L. Kenyon.
L. Stewart of Garlies.
(*E. Galloway.*)
L. Ribblesdale.
L. Harris.
L. Ranfurly.
(*E. Ranfurly.*)
L. Rosebery.
(*E. Rosebery.*)
L. Kilmarnock.
(*E. Errol.*)
L. Poltimore.
L. Denman.
L. Oranmore and Browne.
L. Kintore.
(*E. Kintore.*)
L. Leigh.
L. Elgin.
(*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
L. Belper.
L. Brougham and Vaux.
L. Kinnaird.
L. Lawrence.
L. Wolverton.
L. Sandhurst.
L. Aberdare.
L. Norton.
L. Reay.
L. Tweedmouth.
L. Northbourne.
L. Herries.
L. Monkswell.
L. Ashbourne.
L. Thring.
L. Macnaghten.
L. Ashcombe.
L. Hawkesbury.
L. Stanmore.
L. Davey.
L. Burghclere.
L. James.
L. Heneage.
L. Ludlow.
L. Avebury.
L. Alverstone.
L. Allerton.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

NATIONAL DEFENCE.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I rise, in accordance with the notice standing in my name on the Paper, to call the attention of the House to the dangers that the country may be exposed to during the last few hours that may precede a declaration of war, or during the first few days of a contest with a first-class Power; and to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he and his naval colleagues are of opinion that the present laws of the country are such as to enable them to check, if they wished it, the dissemination of news, and to take all other necessary precautions, not only against attacks that might be made on our men-of-war, or on our harbours for the purpose of closing them, but against invasion; and, if not, whether he will consider the desirability of bringing the subject before the Committee for Imperial Defence with the view of appointing a Committee of specialists, partly consisting of naval and military officers, to consider what alterations should be made in our laws for the purpose of securing our own coasts and our own harbours against surprise before the commencement of hostilities and during the earlier days of a war, such Committee to have power to hear evidence both with closed doors and in public, and to report confidentially as well as publicly.

If what is now called the blue-water school have their own way, and if, in consequence of this, we only keep up a small Army, we shall be running a far greater risk of an invasion, during the last few hours of peace, or during the first few days of a war, than when the war is in full swing, when our scouts and cruisers may be expected to be in their proper stations, backed by battleships held in reserve in positions unknown to the enemy. I take this opportunity of congratulating the noble Earl and his naval colleagues on the improvements that have recently been made in the stationing of our Fleets, and in the constitution of the reserve squadron, which will now be more rapidly available in case of emergency. These changes will have the effect of lessening the dangers to which I am about to refer.

But before I proceed let me say how sorry I am that the noble Earl is leaving the Admiralty. During his long tenure of the office of First Lord a great many valuable and important reforms have been carried through which will have a far-reaching effect for very many years to come. I am sure that he will carry with him the good wishes of all with whom he came in contact at the Admiralty, and that we all hope his administration of South Africa will be as successful as his administration in Whitehall.

The failure of Admiral Togo's attempts to bottle up the Russian fleet in Port Arthur with sunken merchant ships, and of the American attempts to close the harbour of St. Jago, has shown that it is by no means easy to block the entrance of a fortified harbour by sinking vessels in certain selected spots while under a storm of shot and shell, and that it would be much easier to perform this operation in time of peace. Portland and Portsmouth are particularly exposed to this form of attack. Anywhere between the Point and Southsea Castle the sinking of a single ship would block the entrance to Portsmouth Harbour, so that no large vessel would be able to enter or leave that port. Of course such an obstruction could be removed in time, but a great many important events might happen in the interval. For instance, the enemy's ships might obtain the command of the sea.

There are other methods by which an unexpected attack may be made and which would be attended with but little danger to the assailants in time of peace. For instance, vessels with the appearance of merchantmen might very well enter such estuaries as the River Thames, steam up as far as Tilbury, turn round again and strew mechanical mines on their way down. The Solent might be blocked in a similar manner from the Needles to the Nab. A vessel might enter Portland Roads, look as if she wanted a pilot, throw mines overboard and steam out again. The French papers say that their submersible vessels can remain under water for twelve hours without causing discomfort to their crews. This means that during the winter months they can remain beneath the surface all day and only come up to breathe at night. The North Sea is probably quite broad enough to protect us against their incursions, but the Channel certainly is not.

The question also arises as to how far submarines may be allowed to make use of neutral bases such as Ostend or Flushing, and what methods could be adopted to prevent them from creeping about in neutral waters among Dutch and Belgian islands, within a three-mile limit. Some modifications in international law will probably have to be made. Port Arthur experience also shows that ships at anchor at roadsteads such as Spithead, or Plymouth Sound would be very liable to be attacked by torpedoes. The 18-inch torpedo now coming into general use is a far more effective weapon than the 14-inch torpedo used at Port Arthur on February 8th. The 18-inch torpedo has a greater range, and would, I think, probably sink any battleship it might strike instead of merely disabling her for a time. We are, I think, in far greater danger when all our Fleets are assembled at Spithead for a naval review than at any other time. The position of all our ships are shown on charts that can be bought for a few pence. A night attack made by fifty or more torpedo boats might sink all our available battleships and destroy our naval supremacy at a single blow. The celebrated attack on the Russian fleet at Port Arthur was made by twelve torpedo vessels, and the Russians have not yet got over the results of it. It is, I think, a great mistake for us to shut our eyes to the possibility of such an onslaught and to its consequences. At the very time at which we feel most inclined to be vainglorious and to boast of our strength, our very existence is dependent on the forbearance and good faith of our neighbours.

Whether we are at war or whether we are at peace, all the forts that protect our naval anchorages should be constantly kept on a war footing as ready to open fire as if they were ships in commission. Precautions that were not required ten or twenty years ago have become indispensable now that new weapons and new methods of warfare have been invented. When war does come, it will probably give as little notice as an earthquake. I do not, however, wish it to be understood that I think it necessary to keep all our sea-coast forts bristling with 12-inch guns. They are very expensive and take a long time to build. After the war had lasted a fortnight, the fear of anchored mines would probably deter an enemy from directly attacking any of our naval bases with battleships. An intermediate type of gun, such as the 7·5-inch or 6-inch would have power enough to pierce unarmoured vessels, and, if mounted in sufficient numbers, would prevent him not only from removing or destroying our mines or laying down explosives of his own, but from reaching any narrow channel which he might wish to block by self-destruction. It would be absurd to wear out the bore of a 12-inch gun in doing work that could be done by a lighter weapon.

The fittings and gun mountings of the heavier guns on shore should be of exactly the same pattern as those used on board ship, so as to be interchangeable. Spare guns should not be kept in store, but should be mounted in sea-coast forts ready for immediate action before hostilities commence, ready to replace the worn-out or damaged guns of battleships as the war progressed, or to be sent abroad for use in a siege. If when the war began the Japanese had not had 11-inch guns in their sea-coast forts, Port Arthur would have held out much longer. I may say here, however, that I think that when the war had lasted a fortnight, if no great naval disaster had happened to us by that time, our existing Fleet, thanks, in a great measure, to the present First Lord of the Admiralty, would be found strong enough to deal with almost any hostile combination. We may have to endure much suffering and heavy losses, but I feel assured that we should eventually get the best of it.

If a naval surprise of the description I have referred to was successful, and our battleships were blocked up or destroyed, we might expect to have to meet an invasion. Many of our countrymen form their opinions of the number of ships and of the quantity of tonnage required to transport an Army from the amount made use of when we had to send troops to the Cape. This I look upon as quite a mistaken estimate. On a long voyage overcrowding would injure the health of the troops, but on a short trip there is scarcely any limit to the amount of overcrowding that infantry can undergo without impairing their efficiency. Besides, the same steamers could cross the Channel several times in a day, using the fire-hose to clean the ship on the return voyage. During the South African War some ships, such as the "Bavarian," carried close on 2,000 men. Such vessels could easily carry 5,000 men or even more across the North Sea or Channel. See what numbers are carried in fine weather by excursion steamers.

It has been said that in case of an invasion the enemy would be able to bring very few horses, and that he would therefore have to fight at a disadvantage with his infantry unsupported. I think that he would bring his guns, and that at first he would endeavour to occupy a large extent of country, so as to be able to seize horses, carts, and saddlery, mount his staff officers and scouts, and relieve his men from the toil of moving their guns with drag-ropes. The mobility of such artillery would, of course, be very much less than that of ordinary field batteries but the guns could be moved by captured horses quite as fast as our heavy artillery was moved during the South African War. In these days of long range, it is not necessary to change the position of guns in action as often as it used to be in the days of short range. It is also a fallacy to suppose that it would be necessary to assemble a large army in any one place before embarking it. Continental nations keep large garrisons in many of their seaport towns. Troops mobilised for autumn manœuvres in the vicinity of a large harbour would attract but little notice in this country. Detachments could leave different ports and arrange to meet on our own coasts so as to act together. If they chose they could land in different places and meet and support one another afterwards.

In the olden days it was almost impossible for sailing vessels to work in concert when out of sight of one another. But at present full-powered steamers, with the help of telegrams, Marconigrams, and other modern inventions, can assemble, make a sort of Clapham Junction at any previously selected place, and time their arrival to a minute. All ships now carry chronometers whose error on Greenwich mean time is known to a few seconds. Of course, fogs and bad weather may interfere with their meeting, but, after all, fogs and bad weather are the exception and not the rule. It is unsafe to rely on them alone when in presence of an adversary who is prepared to run risks. Our torpedo vessels and submarines would undoubtedly do their best, but their unsupported efforts might not be very successful. Troopships full of men are not quite unarmed in presence of a destroyer. Splashes from the stream of lead they could pour out from the men's rifles would be very likely to enter the conning tower, the sighting holes in the shield, interfere with the aim, and disable the officers in charge. In fine weather they could make use of any artillery or pom-poms that might happen to be on board. Under electric light night becomes as day. I think I am correct in saying that during the present war, with the exception, perhaps, of the "Asahi," which has since been repaired, no ship under full steam has yet been struck by a torpedo. Twenty-two destroyers appear to have been at Port Arthur. They have all been accounted for. But not one of them ever succeeded in breaking through the screen of fighting ships that formed the escort of the Japanese transports. The theory that a fleet of escorted transports would certainly be scattered or sunk by a squadron of unsupported destroyers that was in vogue before this war began would appear to require some modification.

In 1866 the King of Hanover received an ultimatum giving him twenty-four hours notice in which to answer. When he inquired where his troops were and where those of Prussia might happen to be, he found that Prussian officers had asked and obtained permission to send troops through his territory from Schleswig-Holstein to Minden. By the simple process of stopping on the road, the Prussians had seized the town of Harburg and several other important positions in the very heart of his dominions. There was nothing to be done but to endeavour to march the Hanoverian Army out of the country as quickly as possible. After a most gallant fight they were forced to capitulate. The Kingdom of Hanover came to an end. A similar catastrophe may await us if we do not take sufficient precautions. Steamers full of concealed troops might take up berths one after another in some of our harbours and commence to disembark at a predetermined time in different places. If simultaneous attempts to sink our battleships and to block our harbours were successful, the enemy might then be able to protect his transports from torpedo attacks, and so reinforce the invading army. A lost battle between London and the sea-coast would inflict untold misfortunes on the inhabitants of these islands, both in their public and private capacity. Such an event must never take place. If we keep up our present armaments I do not think that it ever can take place unless our Navy is surprised at the commencement of a war. If defeated, we should have to accept a dictated peace, the terms of which would probably include the transfer or destruction of the rest of our Fleet, the payment of hundreds of millions of money, and the surrender of the greater part of our possessions beyond the seas. Once the ægis of our protection was withdrawn, the conquest of such dependencies or colonies that the enemy might happen to want could be undertaken by him at his leisure. Our adversary might even insist on retaining a portion of the county of Kent or of Yorkshire. Such an idea may appear to be preposterous to some of your Lordships, but it is not more preposterous than the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine by Germans would have appeared to Frenchmen before 1870. Now, I am sanguine enough to believe that an attempt at invasion would probably fail. Still, I do not think that the odds against it are thirty to one. Supposing that it did fail, and that the enemy lost 100,000 men, that is less than one-thirtieth of what France or Germany claim to be able to put in the field. Such a loss would have but little effect on the result of the war, while if the enemy succeeded it would be death to us as a nation. The stakes would not be equal. We should be in the position of the Athenians after the battle of Aigos-Potamos.

It is said that even Homer sometimes nodded, but our Admiralty must never be caught nodding. I believe that the noble Earl and his naval colleagues are pretty wide-awake, but the Admiralty routine should be such as to ensure that it should never be taken unawares. Considering that a lieutenant or a sub-lieutenant is always on duty when a flagship is in company with the squadron that her admiral commands, and that the Admiralty at Whitehall is a sort of glorified flagship, the supreme flagship of a fleet of flagships, I do not think it is too much to expect that a post-captain should always be on duty at the Admiralty both night and day whether in war or peace. I do not mean to say that he should always be walking the quarter-deck, but that some one of that rank or above it, authorised to act in the name of the Admiralty in cases of emergency only, should always be on the premises, ready to ring what I may call the Admiralty fire-bell. Proper living and sleeping accommodation should be found for such officers, just as is done at the Foreign Office for those clerks whose business it is to attend to despatches in cypher that may arrive at night.

I look upon the habit of taking an occasional week-end holiday as a very good one, for I think that change of air and scene enables many men, especially those who are advancing in years, to retain their health and capacity for work for a longer period than would otherwise be the case. Therefore I do not wish to interfere with the week-ends of the Naval Lords of the Admiralty. I think that the Intelligence Department, with the addition of some officers specially appointed, should undertake this work, and that space should be found to lodge them at the Admiralty. I also think that, if possible, the two senior Naval Lords should have house-room at the Admiralty, not for their own convenience, but for the convenience of the service. Unfortunately, however, the week end absence of nearly all the officials who are connected not only with public Departments but with all large private enterprises, gives a grand opportunity to an enemy who might commence his operations late on Saturday night, or early on Sunday morning, more especially if that particular Sunday was succeeded by a Bank Holiday. Some of the railway telegraphs, those, for instance, that are in use with the object of facilitating traffic, would still be open, and if they are kept in connection with our Government offices, dockyards, principal harbours, camps, garrison towns, and also with such anchorages at which our men-of-war may be temporarily lying, we should have a much better chance of being forewarned and prepared. I have heard that some such arrangement has lately been made with the railway companies. If so, I think that it ought to be generally known.

If a possible enemy, while meditating on the chances of war, felt quite certain that any attempt to obtain some initial successes by surprise would result in failure it would remove a temptation to commence hostilities, and make for peace. Therefore, I think it desirable that the world in general should be acquainted with some of our precautions against surprise. But many of our preparations to resist sudden attack should, of course, remain State secrets. Some military men are desirous of handing over the garrisoning of our naval fortresses to the Admiralty. The Navy is, I understand, taking over the mining operations. It might also be of assistance in the look-out and signalling departments, but with those exceptions I am strongly opposed to any further change. The sailors would be wanted at sea. In the meantime, however, I think that the Navy has a right to expect that the Army will always look upon the forts that surround our naval bases as frontier fortresses, ready to open fire on a possible enemy at a very short notice. A twentieth-century sea-coast fort should always be as ready for action as a man-of-war at sea. The last person likely to be deceived by a sham or empty fort is an enemy who has had the opportunity of studying it in time of peace.

Whenever a foreign squadron enters any of our harbours it would appear discourteous to make special preparations by manning and arming forts. There should be no need of preparation. The forts should always be ready.

The Admiralty and the War Office have power to make regulations dealing with most of the points to which I have alluded. But there are, I think, many precautions that ought to be taken that are beyond their powers, and which would require special legislation. Last year the progress of science rendered it necessary to pass laws relating to wireless telegraphy. If similar special legislation concerning the publication of news is required, it is better that it should be carefully considered in time of peace, lie dormant until wanted, but ready to be brought into operation without a moment's delay whenever war might appear to be imminent. The Admiralty is, I think, the proper Department to have these powers, because it would probably take longer to issue a Royal Proclamation or an Order in Council than an Admiralty notice. When a crisis arises, Parliament may not be sitting, and even if it is, we all know that laws cannot be passed with the same rapidity that was possible a few years ago. Besides, hurried legislation is generally bad legislation. The law might not be altered until it was too late. In other words, it would be a case of locking the door after the horse was stolen.

There ought also to be some local regulations for guarding our harbours against surprise. If the existence of such regulations were known to pilots and to seamen frequenting the port, less annoyance would be caused when such precautions were necessary. By annoyance I mean that our own ships would be less likely to be fired at by our own guns. These regulations should have the force of law when called into existence by the Admiralty. No pilots except those who are British born should ever be allowed to exercise their profession on our coasts. I do not think that even naturalised British subjects should be permitted to act as pilots. Such naturalisation would often be only skin deep. We should rely on the real, and not on the electro-plated article.

The doctrine of " Mare Clausum " will have to be partially revived in our next naval war. The Japanese have, I believe, already done so to a certain extent by cautioning ships to keep clear of the Pescadores. To protect us against invasion and to save our battleships from destruction, the three-mile limit must be extended to the enemy's shores. It would be scarcely possible for our admirals to protect the country properly if they are not allowed a free hand both in the North Sea and Channel. We ought also to be able to deal in a summary manner with neutral yachts and merchant-ships, that might act as scouts, on a real or pretended voyage. During this war the Japanese have been wonderfully successful in concealing the positions of their battleships and larger vessels. Whenever the Russians made a sortie from Port Arthur the Japanese battleships always turned up from somewhere before the Russians had got very far. We do not yet know for certain what ships were engaged in the various actions. The Japanese Press laws must be worth studying. While not permitting the publication of certain war news, they allow of a considerable freedom of criticism. Should we be equally successful in keeping secret the whereabouts of our ships under our present laws ?

When the Dogger Bank incident took place we played our cards face up, exposed to the view of a possible enemy. It was, perhaps, well in that case that the Russians should know that we were ready to strike. But if we had wished to act otherwise, if we had wished to play our cards unseen—that is, if we had wished to move our ships without its being known—could we have done so in the present state of the law ? I doubt it very much. I have not come down to this House with a cut-and-dried Bill of my own dealing with all the problems to which I have alluded, for I do not consider that any one man in Great Britain is capable of drafting such a document in a satisfactory manner. Such a Bill, I think, would require to be drawn up with the assistance of two naval officers, well acquainted with the details of the Russo-Japanese War and with our own manœuvres, in conjunction with two military officers of similar standing and experience. They would require the aid of a lawyer of repute and ability, and of a Parliamentary draftsman before a Bill could be produced which would be likely to be of practical use. Such a Committee, before reporting, would have to examine harbour-masters and other persons with local knowledge, such as managers of docks, railways, and telegraphs. It would also have to call before it gentlemen of the Press, as cases might occur when it might be necessary to check dissemination of news, and this would have to be done in such a manner as to give the minimum of annoyance. As it would be most undesirable to give any possible enemy information which might disclose the weak points in our armour, the Committee should have power to hear evidence, not only in public, but also with closed doors, and to send in a confidential as well as a public Report if it thought proper to do so.

I have seen some complaints in the German Press about the changes in the stationing of our Fleets. The writers of these articles take quite a wrong point of view. The alterations in the stationing of our ships are a compliment to the efficiency of the German Navy, and ought to have the effect of augmenting the respect that the two nations feel for one another. Had we, on the contrary, taken no notice of the increase in magnitude and efficiency of the German fleet, I could well have understood that some German naval officers would have felt hurt at our self-satisfied complacency. I am also glad to see that the manœuvres for 1905 and 1906 are to take the practical form of exercising our Fleets in the oceanic strategy of passing from peace to war. I am now asking that equal attention should be paid to the tactics of passing from peace to war on our own coasts. There is, unfortunately, a belief in this country that some premonitory growls will always give us time to prepare for the tiger-spring of war. We may feel the claws and teeth first. The growls will come afterwards. I beg to put the Question standing in my name.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, I have to thank the noble Lord for the very kind manner in which he spoke of the Department over which I have had the honour of presiding during the last four years. I was aware when I read the noble Lord's Question on the Paper that it raised matters of great importance; but I was not fully prepared for the great extent of field over which he proposed to travel. I do not propose to discuss the very interesting and old question whether this or any other country is liable to sudden attack from a friendly Power at a moment of profound peace, when there is not a diplomatic cloud upon the horizon. Nor did I propose to discuss the adequacy or otherwise of the standard of naval strength which, by common consent, has been maintained by Parliament in recent years. Nor can I speak at any length upon the general question of invasion which the noble Lord has raised.

I cannot, however, pass by what he has said without some observation. I do not share all the views that he expressed on that subject. I think he has greatly underrated the difficulties which would face a naval invader, because he has been considering, not the case of our having lost the command of the sea, but of invasion when the struggle for the command of the sea has not yet commenced. I do not think he would get many naval officers of experience lightly to undertake the responsibility of such an invasion under the conditions which he adumbrated. It is a matter that has engaged the most constant and unremitting attention of the Committee of Imperial Defence; and, generally speaking, the more the question is examined the more it results in the conclusion that the whole thing depends on the command of the sea. The temporary loss of command through negligence or accident for a few hours never would put such an opportunity in the way of an invader as would enable him to land in this country a force sufficient to maintain itself and to subdue the military power of this country.

The whole experience of the existing war between Russia and Japan lends force to the truth of that conclusion; for any one who has followed that war in its naval aspect must have seen the possessing nervousness that haunted the Japanese so long as there was a Russian fleet in being, and they had troops which they wanted to transport. Every naval incident, from the beginning of the war to the taking of Port Arthur, really hinged on a question of transport of troops, the Japanese wishing to get their troops across, the Russians wishing to prevent them; and never did the Japanese take any serious risk in the matter at all. There are matters embraced in the speech and Question of the noble Lord that I would like to say a few words about. He has reminded your Lordships that in war there always will be two periods, a period of war and a critical period of suspense before war, the period when it is uncertain whether war will take place or peace can be preserved. Now there is no doubt that it is that preliminary period which causes the most anxiety to all those who are responsible for these matters; the problems which would confront the Admiralty or the War Office in war are comparatively simple. It is this emergency period, when Governments will be most anxious to take no step which would precipitate a war which might have been avoided, and when they are in doubt as to the real and ultimate intentions of the Power with whom their relations are strained—it is that period which gives rise to the greatest anxiety.

The noble Lord asked whether the present laws enable us to check the dissemination of news, and to take all other necessary precautions against attacks and invasion. As far as I am aware, I do not know of any strengthening of the law or any change of the law that is necessary to enable the Admiralty and the War Office to do all that it is their duty to do in respect of those other necessary precautions to which the noble Lord alludes. The questions embraced under the words of his Question fall within the responsibility of the Admiralty and the War Office. I believe their powers are quite adequate to safeguard the interests of the country in respect of those other necessary precautions; and whether those necessary precautions are taken or not is not a question, in my opinion, of change or amendment in the law, but of whether the Admiralty or War Office are adequate to the duty which is imposed on them.

When I pass to the other point, whether the present laws of the country are such as to enable them to check, if they wish it, the dissemination of news, I know I am confronted by a problem of the greatest difficulty, and a matter of the most serious import. I entirely agree with the noble Lord that it is a question which, as much as any that I know of, must command the study of the Committee of Imperial Defence. But I would go much further than that; it is a question not only for the Committee of Imperial Defence, or for the Government of the day, it is a question for the Opposition of the day, for the whole of Parliament, and for the whole of the Press also. This is not a question which, in my opinion, can be settled by any Government on its own responsibility, or by Parliament acting as a Parliament and distinct from any Party lines; it is a matter on which Parliament must invoke the patriotic co-operation and collaboration of the Press; and it is from that point of view that I ask both Parliament and the Press to begin to study this question, and to think of the solution to which we ought to look forward, because I am not exaggerating when I say that the most patriotic journalist, without a thought that he was doing his country any harm, might in the day or two which precedes war publish news which might mar the whole issue of the naval campaign of this country.

That is the position of the law as it at present stands. It is a position with which no public body of men of this country, whether politicians or journalists, can be content; and I thank the noble Lord for having given me an opportunity of trying to impress on my fellow-countrymen the importance of a question which has hitherto been too much neglected in this country. Again I would point to the experience of the Japanese War. I believe—I am not in the confidence of the Japanese Admiralty—that if you were to ask them with regard to the command of the sea which they have obtained, and on which the whole issue of the war for them must eventually depend, they would say that what they have done could not have been done unless they had had full powers to prevent the dissemination of news affecting the movements and the positions of their ships. And it is with that object-lesson before my fellow-countrymen that I ask them to study this question.

*Earl SPENCER: My Lords, the circumstances in which we are placed to-day are peculiar, for I feel that we may perhaps have heard for the last time the First Lord of the Admiralty address your Lordships in his official capacity. I should like, therefore, to say something with regard to the Admiralty and the Board of which the noble Lord is the head. I think every one will agree with me that no one could elucidate a difficult and complicated subject better than the noble Lord, or make a statement more complete on all naval matters brought before your Lordships. I will go further, and say that the Board over which he has presided has been remarkable for many important changes in the organisation and administration of the Navy, most of which, personally, I entirely agree with. Of course, I have always wished there could have been a little more economy in regard to the finances of the Navy, but now on this occasion I can congratulate the noble Lord and the Board of Admiralty on the fact that for the first time for many years there is shown a very considerable and large reduction in the Naval Estimates. I congratulate the noble Lord on that, and I lament that we are losing his services at the Admiralty, for we might even hope for still further reductions in the future Estimates of the Navy without impairing in the slightest degree that great force whose efficiency it is so important to keep to the highest level.

The noble Earl has dealt very ably with Lord Ellenborough's speech. I am afraid that if people believed absolutely all that the noble Lord said in that speech they would hardly be able to sleep in their beds owing to the many dangers he has depicted. As far as I understood him, he advocated that the matters he brought forward should be dealt with in a Bill. That would be a longer Act of Parliament than any hitherto framed. In reality you must trust to the Board of Admiralty to deal with all these matters. I confess that I myself have confidence in them; I believe they would take these matters into consideration, and if the time came that they would be as capable of dealing with them as Naval Boards in the past. A great deal has been done in order to meet those very difficulties and those new phases of naval warfare to which the noble and gallant Lord has referred. Why is it we have increased the defences of so many of our ports? Surely it is to protect our ships against such attacks? Why have we got such an enormous fleet of torpedo destroyers, and why have we introduced these new vessels, the submarines? These were all new methods in order to increase the defence of the country and in order to guard better against such incursions as the noble and gallant Lord foresees.

I have only one word to add as to the subject mentioned in the last part of the noble Lord's speech. We know, as the noble Lord has said, that even a very patriotic Pressman might do an infinity of harm by giving certain naval movements just before the breaking out of war. How that should be dealt with it is difficult to see. We know that the Japanese have, by their precautions, kept secret almost all their intended movements both on land and by sea. I have great confidence, as the noble Earl opposite has, that the patriotism of the Press and the public would support any well-devised scheme for protecting the Fleet and the country from dangers of this sort; and in that, I think, we must rely rather than on legislation. It may be that some legislation might be necessary; but I think the best way, as the First Lord of the Admiralty put it, is rather to depend on the good feeling of those concerned. I think your Lordships are indebted to the noble Lord for raising this very interesting subject, and to the noble Earl for another of those able and lucid speeches which your Lordships have so frequently had occasion to appreciate.

The subject then dropped.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 3rd March, 1905.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SUBSTITUTED BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, introduced pursuant to the provisions of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, and referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 62 has been complied with, viz.:—Highland Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

JUVENILE SMOKING.

Petition from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SPRING ASSIZES ACT, 1879.

Copies presented, of Two Orders in Council of February 27th, 1905, relating to the ensuing Intermediate Spring Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC OFFICES (ACQUISITION OF SITE) ACT, 1895, SESSION 2; PUBLIC OFFICES (WESTMINSTER) SITE ACT, 1896; PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE ACT, 1897; PUBLIC BUILDINGS EXPENSES ACT, 1898; AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS EXPENSES ACT, 1903.

Account presented, showing the moneys issued out of the Consolidated Fund, the moneys borrowed and the securities created in respect thereof, the disposal of moneys issued to the National Debt Commissioners for temporary investment, and the expenditure, under the provisions of the Acts, to March 31st, 1904; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 71.]

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 445 (Leeward Islands), Annual Report for 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GERMAN TARIFF.

Copy presented, of Statement showing (1) the new German "General" Customs Tariff; (2) the Modifications made in that Tariff by each of the new German Treaties with Russia, Switzerland, Italy, Roumania, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and Servia; (3) the new German "Conventional" Tariff resulting from all these Modifications; with comparison with all the existing rates of duty on imports from the United Kingdom [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

National Gallery and Tate Gallery—Artificial Lighting.

Colonel STOPFORD-SACKVILLE (Northamptonshire, N.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he can say on how many days during the last three years the National Gallery and the Tate Gallery, or either, have been closed to the public for a part or whole of a day owing to the prevalence of fog or darkness; and whether, seeing the inconvenience caused to sightseers by such closing without notice, he can hold out any hopes that either gallery will have the same provision for artificial lighting extended to it as has been sanctioned in the Wallace Museum.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The two branches of the National Gallery were closed in consequence of fog during the last three years as follows:—

Trafalgar Square.

1902. One whole day.
1903. Partially on three days.
1904. One whole day and partially on five days.

British Art.

1902. Partially on two days.
1903. Partially on one day.
1904. Partially on two days.

I understand that the Trustees are of opinion that the exhibition of the pictures in artificial light is open to many objections, and I do not think that the above figures show that the inconvenience caused to the public by closing the gallery can be so great as to demand a change.

Building Grant to Broughton Gifford Voluntary School.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education what was the amount of the building grant made to the voluntary school of Broughton Gifford, Wiltshire, in the year 1870.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) A grant of £90 13s. 4d. was made to Broughton Gifford National School on June 3rd, 1853, and a further grant of £105 2s. 6d. towards the cost of enlargement of school and classroom and a residence was made on May 24th, 1872. The Board have no record of any building grant in 1870.

Responsibility for Weighing of Postal Packets.

Colonel WELBY (Taunton): To ask the Postmaster-General, when a packet of printed papers for abroad has been weighed at a post office, and the stamps required duly affixed, it is afterwards discovered the official has made a mistake in the weight or postage rate, whether the sender, the official, or the addressee is responsible for that error; and what system exists by which it is known where such packets have been officially weighed.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The person primarily responsible for the correct prepayment of postage on a packet of printed papers for a place abroad is the sender. Postmasters are not bound to weigh such packets for the public; but they are at liberty to do so if the ordinary duties of the office be not thereby impeded. In the vast majority of cases of insufficient prepayment there are no means of knowing at the time when the insufficient prepayment is discovered who is the sender of the packet or whether he has been misinformed as to the postage by an officer of the Post Office; and the universal practice throughout the world is to collect double the deficiency from the addressee; but if it is found, as it occasionally is, that an officer of the Post Office has weighed the packet and misinformed the sender as to the postage, steps are taken for refunding to the addressee the overcharge arising from that circumstance.

Payment of Tithes in the Vilayet of Monastir.

Mr. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state whether the four instalments of tithe due to be paid in the months of August, September, October, and November in the thirty villages of the vilayet of Monastir have been punctually and fully paid; and whether it is proposed to introduce into other parts of Macedonia the system experimentally carried out in these thirty villages.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) We have no detailed information as to the payment of the four instalments mentioned, but at the collection of the first instalment not only was this single instalment paid without delay by every locality, but several districts even paid the amount for the whole year at once on their own initiative. The experiments made were intended to serve as a basis for the earliest possible extension of the reform on a larger scale.

Report on Reorganisation of Macedonian Gendarmerie.

Mr. MOON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any Memorandum or Report subsequent to that of May 11th, 1904, relating to the reorganisation of the Macedonian *gendarmerie* has since that date been issued by General de Giorgis.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The communications which have passed between General de Giorgis and the Adjoints are of a confidential character, and no general Report on the reorganisation has been issued since the date mentioned by the hon. Member.

Promotion in the Navy.

Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the average period of reaching each rank in the Medical, Paymasters, and Engineer branches of the Royal Navy has been assimilated to that of the Executive branch; and, if so, whether it is proposed to make any alteration in the relative rank of Marine officers now serving when they are embarked.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The reply to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Ballyhaunis Maternity Nurse.

Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there have been any exceptional circumstances to justify the granting of an inquiry into the necessity for an official maternity nurse in Ballyhaunis dispensary district; whether he will state on what portion of the evidence Sir Acheson M'Cullagh based his recommendation to have a sealed Order issued in connection with the matter; and whether he will order that a copy of the evidence given at the inquiry be sent to Mr. Michael Delaney, the senior guardian for the district.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) Representations were made to the Local

Government Board by ratepayers urging the necessity for the appointment of a midwife in this district. The guardians failed to take any action in the matter, and the Board thereupon directed a local inquiry to be held in order to ascertain the facts. The Board's decision was based not upon the inspector's report, but upon the sworn evidence adduced at the inquiry. A copy of the evidence has already been supplied to the board of guardians.

Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the bulk of the evidence given at the recent inquiry in the Claremorris union regarding the necessity for appointing a maternity nurse for the Ballyhaunis dispensary district was against such an appointment being made, and that Ballyhaunis district has residing within it two medical doctors and two maternity nurses; and if so, whether, in view of the fact that the appointment of such a nurse is in opposition to the public opinion of the district, he will have the necessary instructions given to have the sealed Order immediately withdrawn.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The evidence of individual guardians was opposed to the appointment; but it is to be borne in mind that as a body they had persistently declined to make such an appointment. On the other hand, the expert testimony of the medical officer of the district was strongly in favour of the employment of a trained midwife. There is but one medical officer resident in the district whose duty it is to attend on medical relief tickets, and but one midwife, whose services are not, however, available for the sick poor free of charge. My right hon. friend stated on February 23rd† that it is not proposed to withdraw the sealed Order.

Education of Catholic Children at Larkhill, County Sligo.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Catholic clergy and laity of Larkhill, Collooney, county Sligo, have recently pointed out to the Commissioners of National Education the want of facilities for the education of Catholic children in that district; and whether, seeing that, although the Catholics form 75 per cent. of the population, the local national school is under Protestant management, what action, if any, will be taken in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The percentage of Catholic children on the rolls of the school at Larkhill, which is under Protestant management, is thirty-eight. There are two other schools, about two miles distant, both under Catholic management. The inspector has reported that the proposed additional school-house at Larkhill, for aid towards which the Commissioners have received an application from the Reverend E. H. Connington, P.P., is quite unsuitable and unfitted for school purposes.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state with regard to the evicted tenants reinstated by the Estates Commissioners under the Act of 1903: total number of evicted tenants reinstated up to December 31st, 1904; name of each tenant; name of estate from which he had been evicted; area, former rent, and valuation of farm; county and townland where farm is situated; whether tenant was reinstated in farm from which he had been evicted or provided with new farm; full particulars in either case of the terms under which the tenant was reinstated, showing amount of annuity; and whether reinstatement was carried out in connection with or independently of sale of estate from which tenant had been evicted.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Commissioners are preparing an interim Report of their proceedings in respect of the period to December 31st, 1904, in accordance with the form prescribed under Section 23 (14) of the Act. This Report will contain very full particulars as to the operations under the Act, including the reinstatement of evicted tenants, but it will not contain information of the detailed character indicated by the hon. Member.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1081.

Pending the publication of the Report the Government is not prepared to impose on the Commissioners the preparation of supplemental Returns.

Proportion of Field Guns to Sabres and Bayonets in Armies of Great Britain, France, and Germany.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: To ask the Secretary of State for War what will be the proportion of guns to sabres and bayonets when the new order for artillery is completed; and what will be the relative proportions in the British, French, and German armies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The proportion of field guns to sabres and bayonets in the British Field Army will be 1 to 220. In France the proportion is 1 to 346. In Germany the present proportion is 1 to 180, but it is not possible to say what the proportion will be when the German army is provided with the new quick-firing gun.

SHIPOWNERS' NEGLIGENCE REMEDIES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

[SECOND READING.]

SIR HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse), in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, said that for some years past the two great Parties of the State through their respective Governments had laid down the policy, and carried it out by their legislation, of guarding workmen engaged in various employments as far as possible from injury, and of enabling those workers, if injured through the negligence of their employers, to obtain compensation. The present Bill strictly followed these non-Party lines, and therefore he hoped to receive the support of both sides of the House. Respective Governments, by the Factories Act of 1895, by the Employers Liability Act of 1880, and by the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897, had, he thought, fully borne out his opening statement. The negligence that this Bill desired to guard workmen against, however, was not quite that of the Employers' Liability Act, because instead of trying to guard the workman against the negligence of his employer, it endeavoured to guard him against the negligence of a third person, who was, in truth, the employer of his employer. The liability of any shipowner in this country, or of any employer, was not increased by this Bill. The Bill simply sought to make effective the existing law, and to enable a workman to secure reasonable compensation when personally injured by the negligence of persons who were theoretically liable, but who in practice escaped with impunity. Hitherto all attempts to deal with this matter had been hindered by difficulties with regard to international law, and he would say at once that the last thing he desired to do was to embitter the relations which now existed between other countries and ourselves. Therefore the promoters of this measure had been obliged to bring in a Bill which should cover shipowners of all nationalities, but they had no desire whatever to harass in any vexatious manner British owners of ships. They would be most happy to accept any form of words that could be suggested which would place it beyond the bounds of possibility that British shipowners should be vexatiously harassed. On that point he would only ask that whatever those words might be they should not conflict with international law or international policy. Further than that, they would be willing to accept any drafting Amendments which the Law Officers of the Crown or any other Gentlemen learned in the law might suggest as improvements in the drafting of the Bill. He thought with that promise, as far as he was personally concerned, he might appeal to all sections of the House to agree to the main principle of the measure.

He asked the House to consider how the law at present stood. The Factory Act of 1895 placed for the first time every dock, wharf, quay, and warehouse under factory inspectors as far as related to loading and unloading and all machinery and plant used. The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897 gave rights of obtaining compensation to all men injured while working in what the law considered to be a factory, and the House of Lords by its decision had now made it perfectly plain that a vessel in dock was a factory for the purposes of both the Factory Act of 1895 and the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897. The result was that men engaged in the work he had described were protected under the Workmen's Compensation Act, but the difficulty was that when foreign ships were being loaded or unloaded or repaired, though the workman was protected in theory, in practice he had no protection at all, because there was no way of enforcing claims against the shipowner if he was not resident in this country. This statement was fully confirmed by the evidence given before the "Foreign Ships (Application of Statutory Requirements) Committee" by Mr. Arthur Norman Hill, the secretary of the Liverpool Steam Shipowners' Association.

Two cases which had been heard in our Law Courts showed perfectly plainly the position of the law at the present time. The first case, that of "Whitewood *v.* Andorsen Becker & Co.," was argued before the Lord Chief Justice on November 13th, 1894. The plaintiff, a stevedore, was engaged in the discharge of a German vessel, and, through the admitted neglect of a member of the crew in removing a guy rope to an unsafe position, received injuries which would prevent him from ever resuming his occupation; but he was nonsuited on the ground that the defendants, who were the agents of the shipowners, were not responsible, and the shipowners could not be sued as they were not domiciled or ordinarily resident within the jurisdiction. The second case was that of "Shea *v.* Drolenvaux," in which a stevedore's labourer was engaged to work at loading a ship in the Port of London. Whilst so working on board the ship he was injured through accident. He accordingly claimed compensation under the Act against the agents. The County Court Judge dismissed his claim on the grounds that although the ship might be a factory for the purposes of the Act, and although the persons in possession of the ship might be undertakers within the meaning of the Act, still the agents were not liable to pay compensation, for they never had possession of the ship or any control of it, the foreign crew retaining possession during all the time of loading. On appeal the Court of Appeal upheld the decision of the County Court Judge, holding that it was clear that the agents were not undertakers within the meaning of the Act.

But what was the treatment which our British ships received when unloaded by foreign work? That was made perfectly plain by the case of the steamship "Lochness" of Dundee. The steamship "Lochness" was delivering a cargo of coal at Flensburg in January, 1896, and during the operation the hatches were removed and replaced by the labourers employed. Through some defect in the fitting of a hatch a workman was precipitated into the hold, sustaining injuries from which death resulted. Both the ship and the master were duly arrested and only liberated on satisfactory bail being given. Civil proceedings were instituted against the shipowner, the claim being ultimately compromised, but notwithstanding the fact that the relatives of the deceased were pecuniarily recompensed, the authorities took proceedings under the Criminal Code against the master of the vessel for negligence. Thus there was a very grave and gross inequality between the law relating to foreign workmen in loading British ships and that relating to British workmen unloading foreign ships, and if for no other reason than that it was surely time for the House to deal in a drastic manner with that gross inequality. This constituted what were known as cases *in personam*, and in such cases there was no redress for a workman injured by negligence. It was a curious thing that where a foreign ship collided with an English ship in entering a port, the owner of the British vessel could seize the foreign vessel and by means of having seized it obtain redress for the damage done. Surely if redress of damage or injury to a ship could be secured, how much more necessary was it that they should enable compensation to be secured for damages which unfitted the person injured for pursuing his occupation and often resulted in his death?

What the promoters of this Bill ventured to suggest to the House was the passage of what was practically a one clause Bill, proposing to alter the machinery of the law in such a way that actions *in personam* should be carried out in precisely the same manner as actions *in rem*—that was to say, that action could be taken in a Court of summary jurisdiction, after which the ship could be seized by bailiffs, or bailiffs' officers sent on board, a notice nailed to the mast, and the bailiffs' officer placed by the mast, with the result that in a very short space of time bail or security would be forthcoming for the damage sustained, and the ship would be immediately released on satisfactory security being obtained. He might point out that where a barge unloading a foreign ship in port was sunk by the negligence of the foreign captain or his crew, the barge-owner could obtain damages and compensation for the loss of his barge, but for the unfortunate man on the barge, if he were drowned or seriously injured, no damages or compensation whatever could be obtained. That also was a serious defect in the law which he hoped before many sessions were past this House would have remedied. The promoters did not think that the delay caused, if their proposal were adopted, would in any case be severe or vexatious. It had not been found in practice to be so in actions *in rem.* Nor did they think that British shipowners would be in any way unduly harassed by the changes they proposed in the law. This was not a new idea. It was simply an attempt to make operative a law which really existed and should be put into practice. He did not think it necessary to say anything further with regard to Clauses 2, 3, or 4. He had endeavoured to state as plainly as a layman could what he thought were the great defects in the law; the only thing he desired was that the House should approve the principle of the Bill he was laying before them. He had to the best of his ability placed before the House a measure conceived in a non-Party spirit, with the object of extending further protection to some of the humblest of their fellow-subjects, and, relying upon the spirit which always animated the House, he confidently asked for their help and support in passing the Bill. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.), as having been a member of the Committee on the Application of Statutory Requirements to Foreign Ships, and also as having introduced a similar Bill on a previous occasion, desired to support the proposal embodied in the present measure. He thought it remedied a great existing mischief and introduced an important amendment of the law. He would make one qualification, however, namely, that there should be no vexatious provisions which would affect the proper interests of British shipowners, and this was common ground. The mischief aimed at arose from the non-residence of the foreign shipowner and the impossibility in that case of asserting rights which existed, which had been infringed, but which infringement could not possibly be pecuniarily redressed. Though there might have been actual negligence on the part of the agents and servants of the foreign shipowner, though there might have been loss of life or injury to limb, and though a verdict might even have been obtained, yet owing to the possible removal of the ship, in consequence of the absence of the owner, and the impossibility of detention of his ship, the judgment became illusory, the unfortunate litigant was saddled with costs in addition to the pecuniary injury which he had sustained, and a great reproach was brought upon the state of the law. That reproach was intensified by another consideration, and that was the apparent privilege given to property when injured as compared with injury to life or person. If an injury was done to any property on board a ship, or to the ship itself, or to cargo, there was redress, but where injury occurred to life or to person, there was practically and eventually no remedy. He knew of no foreign country where a similar state of the law existed, and in Scotland the law was different and just to the employee. Shipowners should remember that in this case they themselves were the victims of some injustice, because British shipowners had to pay for those injuries, while foreign ships were practically exempt from them. Foreign shipowners thus practically gained a differential benefit as bonus, for they were enabled to trade under a distinct advantage in competition with English shipowners. Consequently this provision applied for the redress of an evil to British shipowners just as in other cases. This Bill removed an injustice, a differential injustice, to the British shipowner by submitting his competitors to the same just liabilities as he himself was subjected to.

He might say that as one who had an interest in shipping he believed this was an Act for the redress of a distinct injustice to shipowners themselves. Under Admiralty law, a ship being movable, the first step to take was to arrest the ship. This was the very foundation of the law because security was obtained by possession of the ship, or by the bail upon which the ship was released. But the precedent which he would cite in favour of this Bill was that of the County Courts Admiralty Jurisdiction Acts of 1868 and 1869. This was rather an instance of the statutory power of arrest where the vessel was likely to be moved. Under these Acts there was a distinct repetition of the very mischief they were speaking of. Those Acts distinctly recognised in the case of the British shipowner the principle in this Bill as being one which ought to be applied to foreign shipowners as well. The provision in the County Courts Acts of 1868 and 1869 was that where either the Judge or the registrar of a County Court with jurisdiction in Admiralty was satisfied that the ship was likely to be removed out of the jurisdiction of the Court before satisfaction of the injury which had been sustained, he might order—and it was a simple everyday occurrence—that arrest should take place. The arrest took place immediately the claim was put in, and thus security was given for compensation to the injured.

He should like to inform the House of the extent of the mischief against which this Bill was directed. Before the Committee which heard evidence upon this subject, it was stated that during the last eight years in the Port of London alone there had been eight cases of loss of life in respect of which no compensation could be obtained. There were fifty serious cases of injury in the Port of London during that period, and if they applied that average to Hull and Liverpool and the rest of the ports they would at once see what an immense amount of unredressed injustice, suffering, and loss existed, which certainly ought to be removed. They were dealing with a distinct evil of very great magnitude, and it was a very great injustice. He was aware that one objection that might be entertained was in regard to treaties. He was aware that upon this question they were under treaty obligations, and that those treaties must be observed. It was perhaps not quite so important that they should have this power of arrest where the owner was accessible and liable, and where the injury could be readily inquired into. The County Courts having jurisdiction in Admiralty were numerous, and that jurisdiction could be given to any County Court in a particular district by an Order in Council. There were probably some eight or ten Courts possessing Admiralty jurisdiction. Under the County Courts Acts if the vessel was likely to be removed not from England but from any particular County Court district the arrest might take place, and it would be a vexatious course to take to declare that a shipowner in the port of London or Hull, who desired his ship to proceed to Cardiff or Liverpool, should be subject to arrest when the owner, who was responsible, was resident within the jurisdiction of the Court. This was a question of freeing ships from arrest in Great Britain, because under the County Courts Acts if they removed from one Court to another they would be liable to arrest, which would undoubtedly be a great hardship. He thought it was admitted that upon this question there was a real mischief touching a poor class of people, which ought, without delay, to be redressed.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said a very few words would suffice from him after what had been already said on this Bill to elucidate the position of shipowners in this matter. They all sympathised with the objects and the principle of this measure; from the point of view of placing foreign ships upon the same basis and subject to the same regulations in our ports as British ships this Bill had their hearty sympathy. The only reservation that a British shipowner made or could make in regard to this Bill had already been indicated in the admirable speeches which had been made by the promoters of this measure. The British shipowner was already subjected to far too many harassing regulations. They did not want any more of those regulations, and this Bill, excellent as was its intention in the drafting, evidently placed the British shipowner in a worse position than he was to-day; it rendered his vessel liable to summary arrest in cases of personal injury, notwithstanding the fact that, being domiciled within the United Kingdom, redress was open to the person injured by the ordinary process of law. Of course this might not happen, but, to take an extreme case, it might possibly be that a vessel of very great value, on the point of sailing, and just finishing her loading, might be summarily arrested for a personal injury of a comparatively trifling character, notwithstanding the fact that the owner was perfectly willing to give redress by the ordinary process of law. That would mean delay, and delay to business men meant expense; and in the case of a vessel of very great value it might mean the loss of one tide or two tides, and very vexatious and needless consequent damage. They wanted to see a provision inserted in the Bill that would remove the risk of such vexatious proceedings. He understood that some question arose in regard to the treatment of foreign shipowners, but he should have thought that they need not be so extremely careful in regard to their susceptibilities when placing foreign shipowners in a position of equality in our ports with British shipowners. Whatever might be our opinions upon a general policy, there was no reason why the foreigner should be placed in a favoured position in British ports as against the British shipowner. He wished that the Law Officers of the Crown would carefully consider this matter and, speaking from a British shipowner's points of view, he hoped they would have some assurance from the Government that words would be inserted in the Bill which would protect the British shipowner from the risk of needless and vexatious interference. With that reservation from the point of view of British shipping, they heartily approved of the objects of the Bill, and he congratulated the introducer of the measure upon the admirable speech in which he upheld its provisions. From his point of view he had every sympathy with those who were injured in their employment, and he desired to obtain for them that equal justice which the laws of this country intended that they should have.

He would say, in conclusion, that he hoped this matter would receive the careful consideration which it deserved in Committee, and that care would be taken, in passing a measure of this kind, that all indirect effects of a prejudicial character that might arise would be carefully safeguarded, so that in doing what was a common act of justice they might not produce indirect effects which might mean inequality. While in this Bill they were proceeding to redress one inequality, they should take care to bring before the attention of the Government any other inequality which might arise indirectly in consequence of the passing of the measure. The Select Committee which considered the question last year had not been reappointed, and he hoped the President of the Board of Trade would not delay its reappointment, so that the shipping interest might have the satisfaction of knowing that, in giving the Bill a sympathetic reception, it would also receive from the Government and from the House further assistance in placing foreign shipping in our ports, in regard to the general statutory regulations, upon fair and equal terms in competing with British shipping.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District) said that after the sympathetic speech by the hon. Member who had just sat down, and the clear speech of the mover, it must be apparent that, so far as a question of principle was involved, the subject need not be discussed much longer. The hon. Member who had just sat down frankly stated, on behalf of British shipowners, that they did not desire treatment more favourable than that which was accorded to foreign shipowners.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR: I rather put it the other way. What we desire is that foreigners should not receive more favourable treatment than British shipowners.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said he was going to say that the existing law was more favourable to foreigners than to British shipowners. He had had the advantage of a conversation with officials of the Government in regard to the matter, and he found that it was practically impossible, without doing damage to our own commerce, to make any difference as regards our laws between foreign shipowners and British shipowners. He felt that the House would be unanimous on that point, and that with regard to the class of cases contemplated by this Bill, and other cases, the law should be equal, and the procedure should be equal in regard to British shipowners and foreign shipowners. This Bill dealt undoubtedly with one of the most difficult topics that could be touched upon by legislation if they adopted the principle to which he had just referred. He wished to point out that the liability of shipowners was not increased in any regard by this Bill. No new duty was imposed upon the shipowner, foreign or British, by the Bill now before the House. The only thing that the Bill was designed to accomplish was to give to a workman coming within the first clause of the measure that opportunity as against a foreign shipowner which he had against a British shipowner to recover damages if a case could be made out in a Court of law. He had received numerous communications from his own constituency, or, he should say more correctly, from ports in his constitutency—Port Talbot, Swansea, and Neath—that in many cases men who had been injured under circumstances which gave them actions at common law against shipowners had found that in the case of foreign shipowners that remedy was quite inoperative, because there was nobody at Port Talbot, Swansea, and Neath who could be sued, who had any authority from the foreign shipowner to accept service either of a summons issued by the High Court of Justice or by the local Court that had jurisdiction in the matter.

Perhaps the House would permit him to give the kind of case that was in his mind. Supposing that a foreign ship was in the South Dock at Swansea, and that some slight damage had occurred during the voyage which did not necessitate going into dry dock, but necessitated painting and repairs that could be done by proper apparatus in the dock while the ship was loading or unloading, what happened in practice was this. The shipbroker or agent of the foreign ship went to some person engaged in that kind of employment in the port of Swansea and made a contract with him. The contractor had then to employ all the men, and supposing that proper apparatus had been fitted up, and that owing to the negligence of the master, or the crew, or someone on board the vessel, a servant of the contractor received injury in some way, at common law an action would lie against the shipowner. They were generally agreed upon that. But there was a case where there was no recourse to the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897, or the Employers' Liability Act of 1880. That was a case of a man having the right to bring an ordinary action in the ordinary Courts for compensation. But supposing the ship were a foreign ship and the injured workman or his friends, or solicitor, or agent, went to the County Court and obtained a summons the question arose against whom and upon whom could that summons be served. It could not be served on the shipbroker because the shipbroker had no authority from the owner of the foreign vessel to accpte service. It was no good serving on the master, because he was not the agent for the foreign shipowner to accept process, and the result was that, though according to the theory of the law the injured man in that case had a right to damages if he could prove negligence, his right to damages against the shipowners in practice was a right which was worth nothing at all, and the only thing he could do, and this he could only do theoretically, was to go to the foreign port and bring an action in a foreign Court against the shipowner in that port, or wherever he could find him. That seemed to him to be clearly a grievance and something that clearly ought to be remedied. If this Bill were passed he thought the Attorney-General would agree with him that that case would be remedied, because, if passed, the case of the workman injured under the circumstances he had mentioned would be precisely similar to that which was created in a collision case.

Supposing a foreign ship entered the port of Swansea and collided negligently with another ship, however small—it might be simply a pleasure rowing boat—but if the foreign ship negligently ran it down and damaged it, the owner could go in a few minutes to the County Court office in Swansea, and however great the ship might be that did the damage, and however small his ship might be, he could ask for a summons under the Admiralty jurisdiction of the Court and avail himself of it within an hour. When the bailiff was on that ship he could serve the summons on the master if he found him, and if he could not find the master he nailed the summons to the mast, and there was not only an actual summons calling upon the defendant to appear on a certain day, but there was an order arresting that ship which put it under such circumstances that it could not get its papers from the Custom House.. If it be the case that where there was simply damage to a ship they could arrest a foreign ship, why on earth when a man lost his life or was injured should they not have an equal remedy—the remedy that would be effected by this Bill when passed.

He was quite ready to admit that this was one of the most difficult class of cases to deal with. There might be need for great consideration in the drafting of the clauses, and whether they looked at the matter from the point of view of the shipowner, the point of view of their Government, or the point of view of the workman, there might be need to amend the Bill in the Standing Committee on Law, or whichever Committee it might be sent to. That, he thought, they were all agreed about. His hon. friend referred to the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897, and he thought, according to his recollection, he laid it down with regard to the law that the House of Lords' decisions had been much broader in this respect than the decisions of the Court of Appeal. As he understood the matter the latest decision laid it down that a ship in a dock was a factory within the meaning of the Act. Well, that was of course very satisfactory from the docker's point of view, but the question how far the claim a docker might have against a foreign shipowner came within the purview of that decision might be a very nice one indeed, and he thought, of course, that before the Bill passed that ought to be made perfectly clear. However, this was not the occasion for dealing with minute and difficult points of law. He thought his hon. friend opposite and himself had made the point of principle clear, and he trusted that the Bill might be allowed to proceed to a Second Reading without a division. He was sure he could say on behalf of those with whom he was acting—the labour leaders in his own constituency—that they would be perfectly ready to accept any reasonable alterations which the great learning and great ability of the Attorney-General and his friends might suggest.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I think, if I may be allowed to do so, I ought to congratulate my hon. and learned friend on the very clear and temperate statement he has made. I may say on behalf of the Government that we understand there is a real grievance that requires to be dealt with, and for that reason the Government will accept the Second Reading. At the same time I think it right to say that we desire to reserve absolute freedom of action in regard to the details of the measure. I think there are some points in the Bill as drafted which must be dealt with when the Bill goes into Committee. At this stage I shall not go into the details, but there are one or two points which I think it is only right that I should call the attention of the House to by way of showing the terms on which the Government are able to accept the Second Reading of the Bill. I infer from what has been said that it never was intended that this Bill should apply to the case of some injury occurring to a foreigner on a foreign ship, either in a port of his own country or on the high seas. That never could have been intended, and yet as the Bill is drafted there would be a danger of its being contended that it would apply to such case, and that it would extend beyond British ports even to the case of passengers upon foreign ships. Of course what the framers of the Bill had in view is the kind of case which my hon. friend has just alluded to. It would hardly do to let the Bill apply to anything happening even in British territorial waters, because of course territorial waters are the highway of nations, and it would not do to apply the Bill to a ship merely passing through British territorial waters, and not at all in a British port. Then what has been said shows that the framers of the Bill had in view the case of owners of vessels who are not resident or carrying on business in this country. If an owner of a vessel has a business established here then he can be sued in our Courts, and I infer from what was said in the course of the debate which has taken place that it is the intention of those interested in the Bill to introduce words for the purpose of meeting this point. What I desire to say about that is that the selection of words for that purpose would require the most careful consideration. It would be necessary to see what the Foreign Office have to say, and to see that no ground is given by the Bill which would enable foreign countries to say that we were interfering with the freedom of trade, or that their rights were in any way infringed. The only other observation I have to make is this. To my mind the one great danger in framing any measure of this sort is the possibility of abuse. There may be a claim which is of a vexatious or frivolous character brought against a foreign ship while in a British port, we will say, and just at the time when she is ready to sail a process of arrestment is put into effect. Members of the House cannot fail to realise that, however unfounded the claim might be, it might be that, rather than lose a tide while the process was pending, the claim would be paid. I mention that point because I think those interested in the Bill will recognise that it is absolutely essential that precautions be taken to prevent a measure which is intended to remedy an admitted grievance from being perverted to what might afford legitimate complaint on the part of owners of foreign ships.

MR. CHARLES WILSON (Hull, W.) said that his experience as a shipowner was pretty considerable both as to home and foreign ships, and especially as regarded the Scandanavian shipping industry. He was really afraid that any legislation which might appear invidious to foreign shipowners might react unsatisfactorily against British shipowners. He had to make a suggestion, namely, that at line 17 of the first clause the following addition should be made: "Unless the representatives of such injured persons shall receive a satisfactory guarantee from the agents of such shipowners to pay all reasonable claims." That, it appeared to him, would meet the case of all the vessels coming into our ports, foreign or otherwise. These had agents, more or less responsible. He sympathised with the object of the Bill, and he was sure that if any injured workman in almost any port in this country were to make out a claim, and receive a guarantee from the agent of the ship for the payment of any damages for injuries caused on board that ship, that would be all that could be required by those who wished to defend the interests of workmen on board foreign ships, but who had not hitherto been able to enforce their claims for injury. He hoped the hon. Gentleman who had introduced this Bill would consider the suggestion which he had made, and, if so, he believed it would do everything which the workmen of this country desired

MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said he would like to say one or two words in support of the Bill, and to congratulate his hon. friend on the very clear manner in which he had put it before the House. There was one point, however, not alluded to by the hon. Gentleman and his seconder, which it might interest the House to know. He believed that the provisions of this Bill were very similar to the provisions of the law already in force in Scotland at the present time, and that the power sought to be granted by the Bill to the English Courts was actually in existence in the Scotch Courts. By Scotch law a ship could be detained where injury had been caused to workmen on board a ship in port. He would like to ask the right hon. Attorney-General whether that was so, for, if so, it was very interesting and important as showing that there could be no danger in passing the Bill now under discussion. The whole object of the measure was to preserve to English working men in our ports the power to enforce the right that was theirs already. Something might be said as to the danger to foreign shipowners of having their ships detained on frivolous charges by British parties, but surely the mere right to a claim for damages against a responsible agent would not prevent a ship pursuing its voyage. It would be against the interests of the foreign owner, if he had a representative in this country; and, as a matter of fact, the latter would not allow the ship to be detained. Then, the risk which English shipowners might be supposed to run from the terms of this Bill of their ships being detained was not really substantial. For if they had got offices or a partner or representative in any port in this country proceedings could be taken against them; and it would not be necessary to detain the vessel. There seemed to be unanimity in regard to the necessity and justice of the Bill; and as his friend who spoke a short time ago said, the intention was merely to reduce the differences which existed between English and foreign shipowners, and to remove these and other inequalities. It was surely putting a premium on English ships being transferred to foreign flags when penalties were put on British ships in foreign ports which were not exacted on foreign ships in English ports. He gave his hearty support to the Bill.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he took considerable interest in this Bill, because he believed that there was a larger amount of loading and unloading of ships in his constituency than in the constituency of any other Member. He thought the hon. Member who introduced the Bill was to be congratulated on the able speech with which he presented it. There appeared, from the expressions that had fallen from all quarters of the House and from every interest entitled to speak in behalf of shipping, to be unanimity in favour of the object which the supporters of the measure had in view. As his hon. friend recognised, every Bill introduced by a private Member, especially in connection with a very difficult question such as this was, was open to amendment in Committee; and so far as regarded the points raised by the right hon. Attorney-General, those who had to do with the fortunes of the Bill desired that the security asked for by the right hon. Gentleman should be provided for. The Attorney-General said that the Bill was so framed as to cover the case of passengers. He did not take it so. The scope of the Bill was only meant to cover the case of those directly engaged in loading or unloading ships, or in subsidiary trades connected therewith, and not to extend to passengers or foreign sailors.

There was another point over which there had, he believed, been much discussion and difficulty. It was the question of the position of the British shipowner. He was sure that his hon. friend who introduced the Bill, and his supporters, had no intention to worry or carry out vexatious legislation against British shipowners. In his opinion the British shipowners ought to be the first to welcome this Bill, because at the present moment they were in an invidious position as regarded compensation for injuries to workmen on board ship in port compared with that of foreign shipowners. If their ships were in a foreign port they might be proceeded against for injuries to workmen; but if foreign ships were in British ports, the foreign shipowners could not be proceeded against—at least, the judgment could not be enforced. He did not think there was any difference of opinion between staunch free-traders and extreme tariff-reformers that where there was inequality in our own Courts as between British and foreign shipowners we ought to get rid of the inequalities and grievances which bore upon the former. This was a case in which the British shipowner was prejudiced by the position which he held. The hon. Member for Hull seemed to be afraid that something was not provided for in the Bill to meet the objections made by him that ships might be attached under vexatious circumstances, leading to loss of cargo and loss of a voyage. That was not the intention of the Bill, and it would not have that effect; although he believed that the suggestion made by his hon. friend behind him was valuable—namely, that where there was in this country an agent, or someone peculiarly responsible for the pecuniary position of the shipowner, there they could have a legal attachment applied to him or to his office rather than to the ship itself. The whole object of the Bill was that where compensation was due for injury that compensation should be paid. They knew that under present circumstances, while a working man practically had a right to compensation, and had even got a verdict for compensation for injury against a shipowner, if he was unable to attach the money directly or indirectly against the shipowner his verdict was of practically no use to him. So long as there was someone who would be absolutely responsible in regard to compensation to the man who had obtained the verdict, there was no reason why the ship itself should be attached. In regard to the foreign shipowner who had no agent in this country, it was a scandalous thing, that in the case of an accident, compensation for which was actually got by a verdict of the English Courts, the shipowner escaped when the ship sailed, and the injured workman had no legal remedy against that shipowner or his ship except by going to a foreign port and suing there. Of course that was absolutely ludicrous.

He was sure that every point raised in the discussion, including those brought forward by the right hon. Attorney-General, would be willingly considered by his hon. friend who introduced the Bill, and that there would be no difficulty in coming to an agreement thereupon. There was one other point raised by the right hon. Attorney-General to which he wished to refer for a moment—namely, in regard to another class of workman equally directly employed in loading and unloading ships; he referred to lightermen. He hoped that that was a point which would be considered when the Bill came into Committee, for he should say that the wording of the Bill as it at present stood did not entirely cover their case. In conclusion, he thought his hon. friend was to be congratulated that in regard to this question they were all at one; and that the only desire of Members on both sides of the House was that this legislation should be carried out with equal justice to the men and to the shipowners.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said he desired to make a few observations on the Bill, and before doing so wished to associate himself with the mover and the other Members who had supported the principle of the Bill. Although he might make one or two criticisms on the Bill they would in no way detract from his desire to see it passed. He fully agreed that the present position as regarded foreign owners was most unsatisfactory. A person who might have suffered personal damage had no claim against the foreign owner because he was not within jurisdiction and could not be sued personally, and also because according to the existing state of the law a foreign ship could not be attached as security for a claim. Consequently, while the British shipowner had to pay the foreign shipowner could sail away without any responsibility. This was a double injustice. It was an injustice as regarded the sufferer, and also an injustice as regarded the British owner. The matter derived additional importance from the fact that the House of Lords had declared a vessel in dock to be a factory; so that all the workmen on board and also the crew came under the Factory Acts. The regulations laid down by those Acts applied to them, and a person damaged could recover under the Workmen's Compensation Act for any injury he might sustain.

There was, however, one point which as a representative of a shipping constituency he had to dwell on. That was, that the Bill did not entirely carry out the intention of the promoters when they said that they had no desire to inflict any additional penalty or disadvantage on British shipowners. As his hon. friend the Member for East Toxteth pointed out, an additional penalty would be inflicted on British shipowners because under the existing law the shipowner was liable for loss of life or personal injury, but his ship could not be attached. There was no necessity, because he was on the spot and could be proceeded against. The reason for attaching a foreign ship was that the foreign shipowner could not be got at; and, therefore, if they had to enforce their claim they must get at the ship. In addition to the personal responsibility of the British owner they were inflicting an additional burden on him by attaching his ship. That might be very disadvantageous in this way. They might have a ship just on the point of sailing, and some person might be injured and the ship might be arrested to secure that claim. A very short detention was quite sufficient to inflict substantial disadvantage on the shipowner. Take an ordinary cargo carrying steamer earning £100 a day. It was only sufficient to detain her one tide in order to inflict a penalty of £50 on the owner. They might be doing that for a very small claim, and it might be resorted to for the purpose of extorting an unjust settlement of the claim from the owner. That being the case, he hoped some words would be inserted to limit the Bill to foreign ships. He suggested some such words as these: "These provisions shall not apply where the owner is domiciled in the United Kingdom." That might cover to a certain extent the case of a foreign shipowner who had an establishment in the United Kingdom and could be personally sued. In that case there was no reason for attaching the ship. He quite agreed with the hon. Gentleman opposite that as long as the owner, whether British or foreign, had a substantial representative in the United Kingdom there was no occasion to attach the ship. They ought not to inflict the disadvantage of attaching a ship, whether British or foreign, unless there was no other means of obtaining justice.

He would venture to refer to the remarks of the Attorney-General and to say that, as far as his judgment went, this Bill was very loosely drawn and left many important points entirely open. He did not wish to refer to matters which were the proper subjects for Committee, but the Bill was so drawn that it was not limited to British ports, although the intention undoubtedly was that it should apply to British ports only. There was, however, no limitation. An action might be brought for an injury sustained on the high seas. Another important point, it appeared to him, was that under the Bill no recovery could be made in respect of damage under the Workmen's Compensation Act. He supposed it was intended that there should be a remedy under that Act. The Bill was, however, entirely confined to negligence, but they all knew that under the Act it was not necessary to show negligence on the part of the employer. It was only necessary to show that the injury was sustained without negligence on the part of the workman. Then, again, was not the Bill rather unduly restricted in respect to the persons it was sought to protect? It seemed to be confined to persons in or upon or about the vessel that did the damage. But suppose damage was caused by those in charge of a foreign ship to persons on the quay—there might be an explosion, a rope might give way or a chain break, and something might fall on persons on the quay—no remedy would be obtainable in those cases. Supposing one vessel collided with another within the limits of the port, or collided with a launch receiving cargo and that men were drowned, why should there not be a remedy? Therefore, it appeared to him that the Bill would require very full and complete consideration in Committee. He thought it should be restricted to foreign shipowners, and it seemed to him that the provision which it was most essential should be extended was that which provided a more complete remedy against foreign shipowners for claims for damage, loss of life, or personal injury, however they might occur, within the limits of the port. Subject to those considerations, and particularly to the exclusion of British shipowners from any additional disability or burden, he should be prepared to give this Bill his hearty support.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said that one noted with sincere pleasure the practical unity there was in the House on this particular measure. He regarded this Bill as being a simple, necessary, and just amendment of the existing law. It would place the British lighterman, stevedore, and dock labourer engaged on a foreign ship in an English port in the same position as a foreign workman engaged on a British ship in a foreign port. It also established a co-equality of treatment as between the British shipowner and the foreign shipowner, and in that way it made for righteousness. The last speech and preceding speeches indicated that this Bill might be extended in various directions so as to include other classes of workmen. He welcomed that from one of the representatives of a great shipping centre. He only wished to add a word of approval of this particular measure. He thanked the Attorney-General for his sympathetic reception of it, he hoped it would be passed, and that it would remove any suggestion of vexatious arrest which was not wanted in the interests of the workmen. He hoped, while safeguarding all necessary interests, they should be able to agree on this small measure, and that reparation which was not now possible would be possible for the some three or four fatal cases, and forty or fifty cases of personal injuries which occurred annually. They were all agreed on this Bill. He only hoped that there would be other Bills also on which there would be practical unanimity.

Sir ROBERT ROPNER (Stockton) said that if a clause were introduced into the Bill to protect shipowners against frivolous actions, shipowners would look upon the measure as the first instalment —the very first—that they had received from the House of Commons to place foreign shipowners under the same disadvantages as British shipowners were under at present in British ports. After the speech of the Attorney-General he had no doubt that the Bill could be so licked into shape in Committee as to be welcomed by every one in that House and in the country. Of course they were all desirous to do justice to their workmen. He did not think that any difficulty could arise in regard to international arrangements. When accidents occurred on British ships in foreign ports the authorities there not only proceeded against the British shipowners and made them pay for such accidents, but they made them criminally liable. He recollected a case in which a man was injured on a British ship at Hamburg and the captain of that ship was actually imprisoned. It was only fair and just that when we were treated in that way in foreign ports the foreigner should be similarly treated in our ports. Of course he agreed that foreign owners should be protected from frivolous arrest, and where the foreign shipowners had agents in this country such agents could be made liable and the vessels allowed to proceed. It might be a great penalty to a shipowner to have his ship arrested at the last moment, especially in the case of large vessels which could only proceed to sea at certain tides, and whose arrest might therefore cause the loss of a fortnight or ten days. All these matters would be inquired into in Committee, and he had not the slightest doubt that this Bill, when returned by the Committee to that House, would be in a form to do much good, and would be accepted unanimously.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N. W.) thought that as the Bill was drawn, a ship on which an accident had occurred might very well escape before an action could be commenced. He suggested to the Attorney-General that the precedent afforded by the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894, Section 688, might be followed, and that any person aggrieved, that was to say, the injured workman or his representatives, might apply to the port authorities to arrest the ship even though an action had not been commenced. It was possible, though he thought not probable, that the ship might sail before process was issued. He thought also that provision should be made that if adequate security were given the ship should not be arrested at all. There was no such provision in the Bill.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) congratulated the hon. Member on having brought in this Bill. It was necessary if any person had a claim against any other person for damage that he should have facilities of enforcing it. At present it appeared that while the law gave him a right, it did not give him the power of enforcing it. This Bill, however, did not, as he thought, carry out the intentions of either the hon. mover or those who supported him. So far as he could see the object was to give facilities in port, but the Bill did not say anything about ports, and it might apply not only to vessels in foreign ports but also on the high seas. He quite agreed that it might be difficult to draw such a Bill as would be compatible with international law He hoped that nothing in this Bill would interfere with the free exchange of goods in the port of London, which was the great exchange of the world.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen. S.) said he had intended to offer some remarks in support of the Bill, but after the way it had been received it was not necessary. All the objects which had been raised were capable of being dealt with in Committee now that the Bill was accepted by both sides of the House.

Mr. HAROLD RECKITT (Lincolnshire, Brigg) said he was very glad that the Government had seen their way to accept this Bill. He had been connected with the shipping interest for the last twelve years; and when he was first returned as a Member to that House he had in 1895 the honour to introduce a Bill with the same object as that sought by the present measure. At the request of the Government he withdrew his Bill on the ground that as then drafted it, by only throwing liability on the foreign shipowner, might place a difficulty in the way of the Foreign Office in connection with negotiation, with foreign countries. That was a matter which should still be borne in mind. He had heard suggestions made that this should be made to apply only to the foreign shipowner, and he desired to warn the House that if that was done it might endanger the prospects of the Bill. He was glad, however, to think the Government had been able to accept the principle of the Bill.

Colonel PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said he agreed with the principles of the Bill, but in listening to the debate he felt there were two things he should like to say. In the first place he was glad to find that steps were being taken to put foreign ships on the same footing as British ships; but he should like to say that in all arrangements with foreigners we generally came off second best. They had it from the speech of the Attorney-General that he foresaw a great difficulty in this matter, and he should like to tell the President of the Board of Trade that there were laws applying to foreign and British affairs, absolutely equal so far as the law itself went, but when it came to be applied the Briton was amenable to the law and the foreigner escaped. His right hon. friend knew perfectly well that in the matter of the hall-marking of gold and silver, foreign watches ought to be marked as well as British watches, but they were not. The foreign watch was not gold or silver, but the British watch was bound to be, and the foreigner came in with impunity and undersold the British article. He only recalled that as an instance. He was rather alarmed when he heard the words of the Attorney-General. When the hon. and learned Gentleman got up he said it would require the most careful treatment, and he also mentioned that the Board of Trade and the Foreign Office would have to look into this matter very carefully. It was always the case that we could deal with the inhabitants of this country, but we were very much afraid of giving the same treatment to those of other countries. There was this danger in connection with this Bill, and he thought it was only right that on the Second Reading someone should call attention to these things. The British shipowner, he understood, was liable now under the Workmen's Compensation Act and the foreigner was not. This Bill was to bring the foreign owner as much as possible under the same law as the British shipowner, but when the Bill was passed we should only be able to make him liable if we could prove negligence, and he would probably escape in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. Therefore, the Bill wanted very careful treatment. He would suggest one thing more, and that was that we should not hamper the British shipowner. If the British shipowner could be proceeded against under the Workmen's Compensation Act, there was no need to hamper him in another way. He cordially supported the Bill.

Bill read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

*Mr. MOUNT (Berkshire, Newbury) said this Bill had been discussed on previous occasions by the House of Commons, and the assent of Parliament was given to it by a very large majority of Members four years ago. He therefore did not think it necessary to trespass on their time at any undue length by stating the objects of the Bill and giving reasons to prove the necessity for it. The object of the Bill was clearly set out in the one operative clause of the measure. It was to ensure that where damage was done by sparks emitted from railway engines to crops, plantations, and hedges, compensation should be paid by the owners of the engine. That would bring under the common law the railway companies, and it would deprive them of the privileged position they now occupied. The principle underlying this measure was that where loss had been suffered, and where there was no contributory negligence or default on the part of the owner of the property damaged, compensation should be paid by the party who had done the damage. That principle had been accepted by the House of Commons in many Acts of Parliament, and he ventured to suggest that it was one which the House should enforce wherever possible.

He would like to say a few words as to the circumstances which called for the introduction of the Act. He would desire to recall to the recollection of the House the fact that when four years ago a similar Bill was introduced it was stated that in response to a circular sent out by the Central Chamber of Agriculture answers were received showing that no fewer than seventy-five cases of fire had occurred during the previous twelve months. That state of things had been going on ever since, and the evil, so far from diminishing, had tended to increase, because for the purposes of the economical working of the railways there had been a tendency to make use of more powerful engines with more powerful blast in order to draw heavier loads. He thought that every Member of the House who had travelled much by train in the summer and autumn must have had much experience of burnt and blackened crops in fields adjoining the railways, and he was sure that Members who represented agricultural constituencies had had many instances of such fires brought to their knowledge, and had had many recommendations in favour of a Bill of this kind. The railway companies themselves were evidently well aware of the danger run by inflammmable aterial stored in places adjoining railway lines, and as proof of that he might cite the case of the Great Western Railway Company, who at a spot between Slough and London had put up a notice warning engine drivers to shut off steam because they were approaching a point where large numbers of railway sleepers were stored. Further, than that he would like to point out what was the practice of the insurance companies in regard to insuring crops or plantations adjoining railway lines. It was the almost universal practice to exclude from policies of insurance crops and plantations within a certain limit of the railways, and where such insurances were accepted special and increased rates were charged, varying according to the circumstances of the case.

It was clear there was considerable damage and loss sustained by fires originating from sparks emitted by railway engines. There was an old-established axiom in the English law that where there was injury there should be a right of remedy. Now he had shown that the injury actually existed, and his argument was that at the present time there was no adequate right of remedy. They would be told by opponents of the Bill that anyone who had had his crop or plantations burnt by fires originating from railway engines had a right of remedy and could obtain compensation. But he would ask the House to consider what that right was. In the first place he would point out that it was of so little value that it could practically never be enforced, and anyone who realised of what that right consisted would not wonder that more advantage was not taken of it. The right was to bring an action against the railway company and to claim compensation, but it was not possible to get that compensation unless the claimant could show that the railway company had either worked its engine which did the damage negligently or had failed to use the best methods in the construction of the engine. Did the House realise what that meant? It meant that the farmer who had had his crops burnt by a spark emitted from a railway engine had in the first place to identify the engine from which the sparks came, and in the present state of our railway traffic, which was daily increasing and which on the main trunk lines involved the passing of nine or ten trains per hour every twenty-four hours, that was a matter of enormous difficulty. But even when he had identified the engine he had to be prepared with expert evidence to show that it had not been fitted with the latest improvements. He had to show that the railway company had not done everything possible in the construction of their engine to obviate the possibility of danger. The House no doubt had some experience as to what expert evidence involved. They knew what great expense it entailed and how conflicting it was in its character, and it was rather too much to ask anyone who had suffered damage or injury of this kind to not only identify the engine but to produce expert evidence of the character to which he had referred. The amount of damage suffered in individual cases was not perhaps very large, possibly a sum of £50 would cover it in most cases, and it was not to be wondered at that the farmer often preferred to cut the loss rather than run this risk of engaging in expensive litigation with the possibility of having to pay the costs on both sides.

That was the great difficulty of the position in which the farmer stood in this matter, and he had had a letter from a farmers' club in Lancashire showing that in scores of cases which had occurred in a particular district since 1901 claims had been made against railway companies, and only in those cases in which it had been shown that the fire had originated in old dead grass on the railway companies' premises had payment been made, while in those cases where the sparks had alighted direct on the corn liability had been denied by the railway company and compensation had been refused. That was no doubt due to the enormous difficulty under which the farmer lay, of proving from what engine the spark came and whether that engine was negligently constructed or not. He ventured to suggest that that was a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, and as long as the present system of law continued, as long as the railway companies occupied their privileged position, so long would this grievance continue. It was because they desired to place railway companies in this matter under the common law of the land with regard to liability for damage which they had done that the Bill had been brought in that afternoon. He did not believe that the provisions of the measure would impose any intolerable strain or burden on the railway companies. He was informed that in the United States of America, in Canada, and in many Continental countries the law was as it was proposed to make it in this Bill. He had never heard of this law having imposed any great burden on the railway companies in those countries, and he did not believe that it would impose any heavy burden upon the railway companies in the country. It was because he believed that the Bill would provide a means for redressing a genuine grievance, seriously felt by the agriculturists of this country, that he asked the favourable consideration of the House to the measure, the Second Reading of which he now begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Mount.*)

Mr. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said that as he was the representative of an agricultural constituency, naturally many of his constituents were interested in the measure before the House. This Bill seemed to him to be based upon the principle of acknowledged justice to those who suffered loss from preventable causes, and those who were responsible should be compelled to pay for the damage they had provoked. He remembered that almost the first session he sat in the House of Commons this Bill was discussed, and although it was opposed by those interested in railways it was carried by a very large majority. Since that time the Government, who professed to be the friends of the farming interest, had taken no steps to meet the expressed opinion of the House by introducing a Bill dealing with the question. He wished to press upon the Minister for Agriculture the necessity for taking some steps in regard to this matter. The great railway companies were anxious to make record journeys, and this created a danger not only from sparks but from live coals, and this danger had been considerably increased in consequence of the great speed at which the trains were now running. One argument used against this Bill was that when the land was sold to the railway companies they had to pay an extra price for it because of contingencies such as those which were dealt with in this measure. To him that seemed to be a very poor argument, and one which had no force as applied to the agriculturists pure and simple. The farmer was not, as a rule, the owner of the land, and therefore he did not get anything for contingencies such as these. It was quite true that farmers profited by railways running through their districts, but there was no part of their business procedure which contemplated such a liability as was brought by the incidents to which this Bill referred.

The Bill was a very simple one consisting of one clause, which was based upon a principle of justice. How far the cause of these fires was preventable he would leave to those who had a more scientific turn of mind, but unfortunately the great railway companies were not eager to make changes which incurred expense unless those changes produced some economic advantage. Unless railway companies could be made to suffer in consequence of the damage they caused by their negligence, they were not likely to take those preventive measures which he believed it was within their power to take. Therefore, he thought the principle ot this Bill was one which would be affirmed by a very large majority. He could not imagine what arguments could be brought against it, except that if the principle of the Bill was carried further then it might become a dangerous principle. It seemed to him that one very simple way of preventing the cause of this kind of damage would be to have inspectors of engines who would pay particular attention to appliances which might be adopted for the prevention of the sparks and cinders flying about which were the cause of the damage. It might be argued that the agricultural industry could protect itself under the present law if they could prove ascertained known damage from a known cause, and that the law as it stood was sufficient to give them redress. He did not, however, think that the farmers ought to be put to the expense and risk of lawsuits in matters of this kind for causes which it was admitted by common consent could be prevented if due care was taken. He supported the Bill because he felt that if the House of Commons laid down the principle that compensation should be given for damage ascertained, the railway companies would very quickly find means of arresting this evil, and that was all that agriculturists desired. That would save unpleasant litigation and a great deal of damage. He thought this measure was so simple that it needed very few arguments to commend it to the House, and he hoped that the Minister for Agriculture would see his way either to bring in another measure or else accelerate the passing of this Bill.

*Lord TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham), in a maiden speech, said he might be permitted at the outset to congratulate the proposer of this Bill on the admirable way he had brought it forward. It would appear that while at common law a railway company would be liable for any damage resulting from the sparks of an engine, on the principle that if a man brought a dangerous thing on to his land he was liable if it did damage, yet, by virtue of the fact that railway companies obtained their land by special Act, they were not liable if all reasonable precautions were taken. That seemed to be borne out by the case of "Vaughan *versus* the Taff Vale Railway Company" in 1860, when Mr. Vaughan, who was the owner of a plantation adjoining the land of the railway, had his plantation fired by a spark from an engine and considerable damage resulted. He brought an action. The company did not dispute the cause of the fire, but maintained they were not responsible, as they were authorised to use the engines and had adopted every precaution that science could invent to prevent injury. The result of this would seem to be that if a man made a private railway on his own land, and a spark from one of the engines caused a fire on his neighbour's land adjoining, he would be liable, yet a public railway, in the case of a fire under similar circumstances, would escape all liability. The public railway acquired compulsorily the land over which it carried its line, and was not liable for any damage done to the land at the side of the line yet in the case of the private railway the owner would be liable. Yet it was possible to conceive that a private railway might be as useful and beneficial as a public railway would be.

He did not think any hon. Members would dispute that a considerable amount of damage did result from fires caused by engine sparks. The hon. Member who proposed this Bill had told them how, in one year, there were seventy-five fires caused by engine sparks. Also during the debate on this subject on March 6th, 1901, the Member for Truro stated he had had several fires caused in this way, one of which destroyed nearly a hundred acres of trees. That seemed to him a very serious state of affairs. It might very often happen that an arable farm lying adjacent to a railway might be fired, and if it happened in the months of July or August the fire would have very serious consequences. The whole of the product of the farm for that year might be destroyed from this cause. He was well aware that those who opposed the Bill might urge against it that a railway conferred great benefits on a district, and that they paid the largest portion of the rates of the parish, and that in a great many ways it conferred benefits on a district. But he did not think that this was always borne out by facts. It seemed to him that in the South at any rate, the tendency of the railways was to cater for the seaside towns and develop them, rather than to assist the agricultural industry by conveying produce cheaply and expeditiously. In some cross-country lines the companies conferred upon the inhabitants the minimum of usefulness that they expected from them. Railways were rather adapted for escaping from the hurry and bustle of ordinary life than anything else. He thought that agriculturists in this matter merely wished for a simple Bill by which they could escape from the legal technicalities which surrounded any action that might be taken for compensation for damage from a fire by engine sparks. He apologised in concluding for intruding in the debate, more especially as he thought no other hon. Member of the present House had had the temerity to address the House before attaining the age of twenty-two years.

Lord Turnour.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) congratulated the hon. Member for the Horsham Division upon the excellent manner in which he had delivered his maiden speech, and expressed the wish that the hon. Member might make many more speeches in the House after he had attained the age of twenty-two. He welcomed in the House the presence of one whose speech and age gave promise of very useful service in debate. In moving the rejection of the Bill, he put the case from the point of view of the railway companies. That compensation should be paid by the person causing damage was an excellent maxim, but surely it would be unjust to require double payment from railway companies. The companies, when acquiring their land, paid under condition that the price should cover any injury that might arise, short of that caused by negligence, from the use of the land as a means of public transport. He had been informed by solicitors for railway companies that in the conveyance of the land there was a clause which said that the price paid for the land covered all possible damage or injury to the adjoining land. It was a well-known fact that at one time the State was so anxious to induce people to make railways that they granted to railway companies this privilege, but they attached certain onerous conditions. They limited the profits, imposed restrictions as to the manner in which both goods and passengers should be carried, and made onerous conditions for securing the safety of the public. As Mr. Justice Darling laid down in a recent action brought against the London and South-Western Railway Company, the Legislature gave the companies their powers in the full knowledge of the risks from sparks in the use of engines. On the faith of the conditions imposed, 1,200 millions of money had been invested in railways, and the average rate of interest was 3½ per cent. It was quite a mistake to suppose that railway companies were so rich that this claim might fairly be made on the shareholders. On every side attacks were made upon them, and their Bills in the House were continually met by blocking Motions. Between the damage done by a railway engine and a traction engine there was no analogy, because the owner of the latter used the public highway, to the cost of which he did not contribute. The railway companies had bought the land, and had paid an additional price for the privilege of using it in this way, and it did seem a little hard now to come down to the House, after such enormous sums had been invested in railways, and say that railway companies were to give up what they had paid for already, and that they were to compensate people for privileges which they had bought and paid for.

The Bill was loosely drawn, it placed no limit of distance, nothing was said as to whether crops were to be growing or not, and there was no safeguard against a claim arising out of the destruction of a bad crop with dishonest motive. ["Oh, oh!"] Such things were possible. People were not always actuated by the same motives as hon. Members of that House. Had they never heard of incendiarism? Why on earth such a thing could not happen in regard to a bad crop he could not understand. How far were the sparks to be allowed to fly? It was a fact that no spark ever fell more than forty yards, and if this Bill was proceeded with it would be necessary that some limit should be placed upon the distance the spark fell, and the fires must occur within a certain distance from the railway. Supposing that a fire took place, who was to prove the value of the crop? Nobody but the farmer himself could speak as to the value of the crop, which might be a good or a bad one. The hon. Gentleman opposite did not concern himself with the question whether the principle might be extended in other directions, but in this House as legislators they should consider what they were doing, and think whether, in passing a particular Bill, they should not be extending a principle. If railway companies were to be responsible for damage done by sparks, why not for that done by cart horses that ran away as the result of fright from a passing train? It was something that arose from the use of the engine for railway purposes, and if the companies were to be liable in the one case he did not see why they should not be liable in the other. Then there was the case of timber yards and houses—in fact, they could multiply all these matters *ad infinitum.* He supposed that the hon. Gentlemen who were so anxious that the railway companies should pay damages would not object to an amendment of the Bill which would enable the companies to charge higher fares to enable them to pay something which was not contemplated when the present fares were arranged.

His hon. friend had said that in America and other countries some law of the sort proposed was in existence now. Assuming that his hon. friend was correct in what he stated, the conditions of railway companies in America were quite different from those in this country. In America the majority of railway companies had land given to them for nothing, or, if they had to pay, it was a comparatively small amount. They were not compelled to put up fences, and the cattle had to look out for themselves; there were practically no Board of Trade regulations as here, and the whole circumstances were absolutely different. The railway companies here had been compelled not only to compensate the owners of land, but to do everything they could to prevent damage. It was not quite fair, therefore, to use the argument that something that was done in America should be done here. In putting the case from the point of view of the railway companies he had endeavoured to be moderate and to put the facts clearly before the House. He hoped the House would pause before passing a Bill which, however acceptable on grounds of sentiment, was, from the point of view of business and the agreement entered into between the railway companies and the State, unjust.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.), in seconding the rejection of the Bill, said he was not a director of any railway company, and that he approached the subject entirely from the point of view of what was equitable. He objected as a rule to class legislation, and here they were asked to legislate for a small and not a needy class, and in their interests to offer up on the altar a much larger and, in his opinion, much more needy class. As the hon. Member for Peckham had pointed out, farmers and landowners had received very great consideration, and it could be shown that they derived very great benefits from the railways which passed through their properties. When railway companies were attacked in the Courts of law it was very well known that there was a disposition on the part of juries to decide against the companies, and it was surprising that the House of Commons was almost always on the same side as the juries. It was made a cause of lamentation at every half-yearly meeting of railway shareholders that the law of the land fined and penalised them in various ways. The argument was often heard in that House that taxation should always be accompanied by representation. Nowhere had that principle been so much violated as in the case of railway companies. Although they contributed heavily to the rates they had no representation on the rating boards, and now, forsooth, it was attempted to penalise them for something for which admittedly there was no redress. The hon. Member who moved the Second Reading of the Bill said it was to punish railway companies for what he called "preventable accidents." The expression "preventable" did not occur in the Bill at all. It might be very advantageous to landowners and farmers, who were already a very much favoured class, that railway companies should be made liable in the way proposed by the Bill, but he did not see on what principle of equity railway companies should be punished for accidents arising from causes which were not preventable. Nobody contended that the railway companies had not had recourse to every invention and every protection known to science, and now they were to be punished because science was not sufficiently far advanced to give them any arrangement which would prevent, in certain circumstances, locomotives drawing heavy trains from giving out a few sparks. He did not think it was quite established that farmers had often suffered in the way stated. They had very rarely suffered serious damage, but if this Bill were passed it would not be very long till cases were got up. The railway companies had been doing, and would continue to do all in their power, in their own interest, to protect the properties which they traversed. On grounds of equity and justice he would vote against the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) said that when a Bill similar to this was brought forward four years ago, the President of the Board of Trade offered some remarks in opposition to it; but since that time it had been decided that, as the Bill was really brought forward on behalf of agriculturists, the Department which he represented in the House should take charge of the matter and give their views upon it. His hon. friend who had just spoken had said that he did not think there was a great deal of interest taken in the question among the farmers of the country; but he could assure him, on the other hand, that if there was one question more than any other on which the Department had received strong resolutions it was this question. During the last eight or nine years resolutions had been sent up from the Central Chamber of Agriculture and from almost every chamber of agriculture and farmers' club of importance in the country, all expressing the opinion that farmers should not be liable to the risk of this loss, which was due to no fault of their own and against which no precaution on their part could possibly be taken. Another class greatly concerned in the question were those interested in the afforestation of the country. This subject of the afforestation of lands was very much to the front just now; but he thought there was small inducement to owners of land to embark upon such enterprises if they felt that in the future all the money they had spent on planting was liable to be thrown away through fire caused by a spark from a locomotive. He would remind the House that one of the recommendations of the Forestry Commission was this—

> "We recommend that the Government be urged to secure the early enactment of a Bill to protect owners of woods against loss by fire caused by sparks from locomotives."

He thought that recommendation ought to carry great weight in this

House. Of course he was only speaking for the Department. In regard to legal questions the Attorney-General would reply.

While it was fully admitted that agriculturists all over the country ought to be protected from fire, it was practically impossible for the ordinary farmer to prove negligence against the railway company, and, because it was impossible for him to do so he got heavily mulcted in expenses which he was not able to bear. But, while careful to do justice to one class, he hoped that the House was fair enough to consider whether they might not be doing an injustice to another class. He was sure that the Department did not wish to do anything which might be looked upon as in any way a breach of faith towards the railway companies. The companies were liable for damages for negligence, if it were proved, but proof was almost impossible. If, however, the onus of proof that there had been no negligence were thrown on the railway company that caused the fire, and that company could prove that it was supplied with the best appliances, no charge of breach of faith could be brought against the Bill. At the present time the public expected the railway companies to carry them at a tremendous rate throughout the country by express trains, and that was where the danger arose of damage by fire arising from sparks. Some of the railway companies had adopted appliances to prevent this danger. He knew in particular of one company which adopted a new appliance some years ago which stopped the sparks from being driven out of the funnel, and he believed that since that time there had hardly been a single case of fire over the whole system. Another company which ran fast express trains used liquid fuel for these trains, and that company had also been practically without complaints. What these companies could do every company could do. It would be to the advantage both of the railway companies and of the whole agricultural population in the districts through which their lines passed if this question could be settled on a friendly basis, and if there were no need for the Bill at all. His hon. friend the Member for Peckham said that if they once started this principle other things might be brought in, and he instanced the case of horses and carts. That illustration was not on all fours with the question of growing crops. A horse was, or ought to be, in charge of somebody who had to look after it, and it was rather absurd to say that that could be put in the same catagory with growing crops which could not be guarded, and through which the railway company's trains were compelled to go. The hon. Member also referred to buildings, warehouses, and timber yards. He did not think that was the same either. These timber yards and houses had been placed near the railway for the purpose of getting easy transit for goods.

As regarded the Bill the Government would leave it to the House of Commons, as they had done in the past; but if it went to the Grand Committee they would reserve to themselves an absolute right to criticise any detail which they thought should be amended.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said that those hon. Members who in years past had complained of this grievance had every reason to be satisfied with the speech of the hon. Gentleman, because it showed that their contention that substantial damage had been done was true. The hon. Baronet who presented the case for the railway companies did so extremely well. The supporters of the Bill had no bias against the railway companies. They were all equally interested in the success of the railway companies. He thought that in most cases they had paid more for their land than they ought to have done. What they wished was to obviate preventable damage, and he should rather urge the Board of Agriculture to consider whether they could not appoint a small expert Committee which would investigate as to the means for preventing fire. There was the line pursued by this Bill, namely, to put the liability on the railway companies; and there was the line of trying to find whether for heavy trains certain inventions and smoke stacks would avoid fire. The sphere over which those sparks, or rather hot coals, spread themselves was much wider than was supposed by the hon. Baronet who moved the rejection of the Bill. He had known a hot coal from a locomotive set fire to a plantation 130 yards from the railway. He should like to see legislation for the prevention of the planting of trees where they would run great risks by reason of their being so near a railway. But to say that there should be no crops or trees within 130 yards of a railway would mean a great waste of land. In Germany the onus was on the railway company in respect of fire arrangements, and every kind of precaution was taken against fire. In Sweden, where some of the best smoke stacks were in use for preventing fire, there was practically no fire at all. In America and Canada there were very heavy trains and engines. At Washington he had a conversation with the French Ambassador to the United States, who told him that he had travelled through Canada two years before, and that it appeared to him as if he were passing through "the valley of the shadow of death," because the whole forest on each side of the railway track was burned. This had led to the promulgation of regulations in Canada, the observance of which had produced a satisfactory state of matters; and fires were now almost unknown there. The same happened in Germany, where fires were common last year on account of the unusually dry season. He thought that an expert inquiry would be useful as showing what precautions were within practical reach to prevent fires at a very moderate expense. He did not believe in taking precautions which would impose a heavy fine on railway companies, or he would be less enthusiastic in support of the Bill.

*Sir JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) said that hitherto when a farmer brought an action against a railway company for damages on account of his crops being burned it had been necessary to prove negligence on the part of the railway company, either by the faulty construction of their engines or by some negligent act of their servants, whether engine drivers or stokers. What he wanted to know was whether the effect of the words in the Bill would be to relieve the farmers from that obligation, and to put on the railway company the obligation to pay for the damage by fire whether their negligence was proved or not.

*Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he was very glad to hear the observations which had been made by the hon. Member for Leith. No one wished that the beautiful tracts of woodland in many parts of the country should be destroyed; and the interests of agriculture ought also to be received with respect in this House. Four years ago, when this question was last under discussion, he had argued that what was wanted was not so much an alteration in substantive law, but in the procedure by which the law was enforced. He had then first made the proposition that the justice of the case would be met by reversing the onus of proof; but that proposition was not in this Bill, and it could not be put into the Bill except by eviscerating the whole of the principal clause. The Bill, he thought, was pregnant with danger to the railway companies, whom it would practically make insurers. What he meant by that was, that it would make the railway companies liable for the damage caused by fires, however much care they had taken to prevent them. The proper remedy would be an enactment that when fire had been caused by a locomotive in fields adjoining the railway, it should lie upon the railway companies to prove that they had not been guilty of negligence. The hon. Member for Leith had made the proposition that the matter should be referred to an expert Committee to devise proper precautions. That was all very well for the present time; but any appliances which that expert Committee might recommend for the prevention of fires might soon be out of date. Failure to come up to the standards of the day in regard to appliances would probably be considered sufficient proof of negligence. As to the persons for whose benefit a change in the law was to be made, there were large farmers and small farmers; large railway companies and small railway companies. He had seen model conveyances of land to railway companies which provided that pecuniary compensation was to be made for all kinds of injury to the land, and that land was bought and sold subject to those conditions. Were the railway companies to be placed in the same position as the owner of a reservoir, who was subject to pay compensation for all damage caused by the bursting of that reservoir, or as a man who kept a lion or a tiger in an insufficiently protected cage? If railway companies were to be made insurers against all kinds of damage because they put in motion a dangerous agency, there were owners of other vehicles and dangerous agencies whose profits were not limited by statute, who were not subject to statutory prohibitions and regulations, and to whom the same treatment ought surely to be applied. The representatives of the railway companies might have to take a division against this Bill, but it was not because they did not think the question capable of a rational and acceptable solution.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said that if he supported the Second Reading of this Bill it was not because he had any special prejudice against railway companies. Although at the present time there was a nominal remedy to farmers whose crops were destroyed it was not a practical remedy, because they had to go through legal processes which sometimes cost fifty or a hundred times more than the damage caused by fires from locomotives. He was not much impressed by the main argument of the hon. Member for Peckham on what he called the fraud question. If an appropriate remedy was given by legal process for damage, there was always a liabilty of fraudulent claims being made; but if that were to be taken into account it would prevent all reforms being made. As to the framework of the Bill there could be no doubt that, as it stood, the railway companies were made universal insurers, no matter whether they used the best possible means to prevent fire or not. He was not prepared to say that some basis of insurance was not the best form of remedy, but he thought it was going rather far to say that, whether railway companies had adopted the best possible system or not, they should be made in all conditions liable. The position was rather a simple one, and it came very much to this—who ought to bear the risk of the insurance, the railway company, the owner of the land, or the tenant? Of course, a prudent man who had crops along a railway line or near it could always insure for a very small premium. It was true that when the land was taken by the railway company in the first instance, the company bought from the owner of the land a statutory immunity from injuries of this kind. Sufficient compensation had been given, on the whole, to the owner of the land to endow him with a fund which, if used for insurance, would provide against those dangerous risks. It would, therefore, be a hardship on the railway company to provide an insurance fund twice over. Of course that was not the universal case. It might be that a railway company ran its line near a property, none of which had been taken over by the company, and the owner of that property did not receive compensation at present for any damage caused by fire from the locomotives.

The best possible remedy, he thought, would be that suggested by the hon. Member for Leith, and that was to prevent the damage being done. He had no doubt that, with a little more scientific application, most of the damage might be prevented. Meanwhile, he thought they could introduce a practical remedy within the four corners of the Bill. To throw the onus of proof of negligence on the owner or the small farmer made the remedy ridiculous. The onus ought to be on the railway company to show that they had carried out every scientific precaution against fire. That would solve the matter, looking both to the interests of the shareholders in the railway companies and of the owners and farmers of the land adjoining the railway lines. He should certainly vote for the Second Reading of the Bill, and he hoped, when it came to be considered in detail in Committee, a fair adjustment on the lines he had suggested might be found.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said he thought that the hon. Member who had just sat down had made a very valuable speech, but he did not see why it had led him to a different conclusion from that of the hon. Member for Sheffield. If the spirit which animated the House was the point of view of the hon. Member for Stretford, the railway companies would not, in his opinion, have very much to complain of. But what he objected to in the Bill, as it stood, was the introduction of what he believed to be an inexpedient and unjust principle, viz., that railway companies should be rendered liable for damage or inconvenience which could not be avoided by any precautions taken by them. If the House sanctioned that principle they would sanction a principle of very wide and far-reaching application, and which would undoubtedly work great injustice to railway companies. The objection of the hon. Baronet, the Member for Peckham, to the Bill was to its principle. There might be cases where very great hardship fell on a tenant farmer, but it could be said that the owner of the land had got from the railway company a fund out of which insurance could be paid, and that the farmer ought to have taken that into account in renting the land and the owner in letting it. If the Bill passed the Second Reading, he understood it would only do so on the understanding that clauses would be introduced in Committee to preserve the principle from unjust application.

He hoped the House would deal fairly with the railway companies in this matter. The hon. Member who spoke on behalf of the Board of Agriculture said he had received very many resolutions from agricultural associations in favour of this Bill, which would place new burdens on the railway companies. He was sure far more representations had been received in favour of the reduction of railway rates, but they could not have it both ways. If they were to have lower rates the House must not insist in passing measures which would cast more working expenses on the railway companies. He should like to associate himself with the congratulations which had been offered to the noble Lord the Member for Horsham on having established a record, and on having given them all the very pleasant experience of such a speech before he had reached the age of twenty-two. He hoped the noble Lord would not think he was detracting from the encomium he had passed when he suggested that his Lordship must divide the honours with a distinguished Member of the House in a previous generation, Mr. Pitt. The noble Lord complained that railway trains travelled slowly, and that the companies gave a bad service; while the hon. Baronet, the Member for Peckham, suggested that one result of the passage of this Bill would be that the railway companies would give instructions to their engine-drivers to shut off steam when passing crops. Again, he would say, they could not have it both ways. The House should be very careful how it sanctioned Bills of this kind, which would lay upon the railway companies new burdens, and increase their working expenses, thereby decreasing their power to give greater facilities to traders.

Mr. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) said he wished to express his approbation of the attitude which the Government had taken up in regard to this Bill. The supporters of the Bill believed that it was not just that they should lose crops, destroyed by fire from locomotives, without the means of securing compensation. The hon. Baronet the Member for Peckham had alluded to the large amount of capital invested in railways on which a limited return was paid in the shape of dividends. He would point out that a vastly greater amount of capital was invested in agriculture, which received a much less percentage of return than that sunk in railways. This was not a question which ought to be settled on the principle of charity but on the principle of justice. Where negligence was proved on the part of a railway company compensation was obtainable now; but in ninety-nine cases out of 100 it was impossible to prove negligence on the part of the company even when negligence existed. The right hon. Baronet, the Member for Berwick had warned the House that the Bill introduced a dangerous principle, but the railway company ought to have the same responsibility to the farmer that the farmer had to his workmen.

Sir EDWARD GREY said that the hon. Gentleman had misrepresented what he said. He only referred to the proposal to make railway companies liable where there was no negligence.

MR. SPEAR said that compensation to workmen was based on the very principle which the right hon. Baronet objected to being applied to railway companies. The responsibility was very properly placed on the farmer in case of injury to any of his workmen; and he, therefore, thought the farmer was entitled to the same protection against the railway company as he himself extended to his workmen. There seemed to be a fear in the minds of hon. Members that to make it simple to obtain compensation for damage would make farmers less careful in protecting their crops. In reply to that he said that the amount of compensation which would be paid to a farmer for the damage, even if the Bill were passed, would still entail on him great inconvenience from the loss of his fodder, which he would require for his cattle during the winter. If the Bill passed—and he hoped it would—it would not encourage negligence on the part of the farmer, because it would still be to his interest to protect his crops as far as possible. He fully recognised the justice of this measure. Four years ago a Bill somewhat similar in form passed its Second Reading by a great majority, and farmers were looking anxiously to this House for a simple measure of justice.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he did not deny that there was a great deal of difficulty in the matter. This case was more difficult than one where it was clear that there was no moral liability on one side or the other. At the same time it must be admitted that the agricultural community had made out a case of grievance; and it was out of their power to take precautions to protect themselves. Therefore, there was a *prima facie* case for the intervention of the Legislature. The law had not been altered since 1860. It was then settled on the express ground that the Legislature had given the railway companies statutory powers; and that, therefore, the provisions of the ordinary law did not apply. But a great deal had happened since 1860. In the first place the people who had been compensated when the railways were built had now forgotten all about it; and it was not regarded as a matter of much significance. The present position of the law was that the farmer was at liberty to bring an action against the railway company, and if he could prove negligence on the part of the company he was entitled to damages. The plaintiff had, however, to prove that the company had not constructed its engine in the right way, or that the engine was running in such a manner that sparks were likely to fly, and had to enter into a great many technical details on which he would be met by expert evidence on the part of the company; and which the company would be better able to supply. Therefore, he did not see how it was possible to regard the law relating to negligence as an adequate protection. Even where a company was negligent, the cost of proving it was so great as to be impracticable. One of the greatest difficulties of the law of England was its extreme costliness. It had been shown by experience that where ever an employer was exposed to responsibility as a result of negligence, it gave him the strongest inducement to take precautions. The reason why the railway companies had not taken adequate precautions was because they had relied on the ineffectiveness of the present law.

He agreed with his right hon. friend the Member for Berwick that the railway companies were being attacked from too many sides at present; and if he thought that the principle of this Bill were capable of indefinite extension against the railway companies he should not be able to support it. Standing by itself, the railway companies need not feel any alarm. But this would happen if the Bill were passed. The companies would have a much stronger motive for taking care than they had at present; and it was highly probable—experience showed it—that they would take more care to prevent fragments of lighted coal being thrown out on each side of the line than they did at present. There was reason to think that the companies did not take all the precautions they might take. When they had to choose between two persons, one of whom had got to suffer, was it not reasonable that they should throw the burden on the person who could take the better precautions. There were comparatively few precautions which a farmer could take, except not stocking his harvest too near the railway line and not planting trees alongside it. What was wanted was to prevent the mischief occurring. That was more important than providing a remedy. It was, however, on the railway company rather than on the farmer that the obligation of showing that no negligence had occurred should be placed. A suggestion had been thrown out by the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division and the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Hallamshire Division that the Bill should be altered into one merely shifting the onus of proof. It appeared to him that it would be quite possible to introduce such an alteration; but it would not prove to be an adequate remedy. It would still lead to litigation. The railway company would prove that they had not been guilty of negligence; and the plaintiff would still be obliged to furnish evidence to rebut that contention. Subject to what the House might hear from the Attorney-General, whose opinion would carry great weight, he should support the Second Reading.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he cordially agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick. when he referred to the interest with which the House had listened to the speech of the noble Lord the Member for the Horsham Division. The speech of his noble friend was not, however, a record, as Pitt delivered his famous speech in the House when he was two months younger. He hoped the House would give a Second Reading to the Bill. He was not impressed with the argument that alarming consequences would follow if the principle were admitted. This was a very special case. A grievance undoubtedly existed. At present, in a large number of cases, the remedy for damage from sparks was prohibitive. No doubt, as the Bill stood, the railway company would be liable even in the absence of negligence; but in asking the House to read the Bill a second time he did not exclude the consideration of such points in Committee. Grievances that railway companies might suffer, according to the argument of his hon. friend the Member for Peckham, might be removed by the adoption of some such proposal as was recommended by the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division; but upon those matters the position of the Government must be absolutely free in Committee. The right hon. Gentleman, the Member for Aberdeen, stated that increased efficacy as regarded remedy would lead to the adoption of increased precautions. No doubt, as necessity was the mother of invention, increased liability would lead to the adoption of further precautions by experts. Of couse it was fair to argue that owners, other than agricultural, had equal claims to compensation; but it was especially the damage caused to crops that gave rise to the demand for legislation. The drafting of the Bill would require close examination, and reserving for himself a free hand in respect to details he hoped the Bill would receive a Second Reading.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said that if the suggestion of hon. Gentlemen interested in railway matters were accepted, it would be useless to proceed with the measure. Merely to shift the burden of proof would be no remedy for the grievance of which agriculturists complained. It was an illusory proposal; and he would suggest to hon. Gentlemen interested in railway matters that the remedy proposed by the Bill was effective and that the person who did the damage should pay for it. The proposal, if accepted, would take the vitals out of the Bill.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said that as the Government had an open mind in the matter and were not prepared to accept the Bill as it stood, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment. He did not accept the principle of the Bill; but he hoped, judging by the general tone of the debate, that an amicable arrangement would be arrived at in Committee.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire) said he would move in Committee to include heather, game, and plantations in the property in respect of which compensation could be claimed.

Mr. BELL (Derby) said that railway companies were usually the right parties to be fleeced. He himself had made many demands on them; but this was a different matter. While people continually clamoured for high speed and excess of comfort on railways, and special engines had to be constructed to meet that demand, there must be sparks somewhere. He hoped some arrangement might be devised by which sparks would be prevented. There was nothing in the Bill which would prevent a company from having to pay compensation for damages to a field of corn which was set on fire at midnight, perhaps by someone else. There ought to be some proof that the damage was caused by sparks from an engine. This should be seen to in the interests of the men who worked the engines, because if a company had to pay compensation for damage to a field they would no doubt penalise the men who were in charge of the engine. The Bill required careful attention in order to properly protect all parties.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said he would suggest that it would be well to consider in Committee the possibility of creating an insurance in which the owners of property and the railway company could take equal shares. This could be done on lines similar to the insurance effected after the passage of the Employers' Liability Bill.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said he was considered to be rather hostile to the agricultural interest; but he objected to the doctrine propounded in the House and developed during the debate by the Attorney-General, that some priority of consideration should be given to agriculture over other kinds of property. He contended that the man who possessed buildings or any other kind of tenement was as much entitled to compensation as the owner of a field.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, &c.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE AND EXECUTOR BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) moved the Second Reading of this Bill, which, he said, had in substance been before Parliament for nineteen years, he having first introduced a similar Bill in 1886, shortly after he entered the House. It was introduced to remedy a very serious evil. They could hardly read the daily papers without seeing a series of cases before the Courts of persons convicted of breach of trust. This Bill affected England far more than it affected Ireland or Scotland. It very rarely happened that there was a case of breach of trust reported from Ireland, and in Scotland there was a very excellent law called the Judicial Trust Act which effectually prevented such a thing as a breach of trust happening. The intention of the Lord Chancellor was to pass a Bill on those lines, and the noble Lord introduced a Bill in 1890 in the Upper House, the legal Members of which all spoke strongly in its favour. That Bill passed through all its stages in the Upper House, but was not proceeded with further. Although there was great opposition to this measure on behalf of the solicitors generally by the Incorporated Law Society, many solicitors were in favour of it, as was evidenced by the letters he had received. The learned Member for Dumfries had taken a very great interest in this matter, and a Select Committee was appointed, of which he was a member, which took a good deal of evidence from Lords Herschell, Halsbury, and Lindley, and from an enormous number of witnesses from the other branches of the legal profession. That Committee had reported that the evidence it had taken put it beyond question that large sums of money were annually misappropriated by private trustees. Although, no doubt, the sum stolen formed a small part of what was placed in the hands of trustees in this country, much loss and consequent suffering was caused by this kind of malversation, those who suffered most being the poor and helpless. The whole case for this change in the law was that it was urgently necessary for the protection of poor persons, and more especially widows and orphans who were persons not accustomed to deal with legal business. In many instances, while they received the income from the trustee they assumed that the fund was all right and quite secure. But a day came when the income ceased and then it was found that the trust property no longer existed. The late Lord Herschell told the Committee that he had long been favourable to the system of a public trustee, not only on account of its security, but because of the reluctance of so many people to accept trusteeship. Lord Lindley testified to the widespread feeling among lawyers in its favour. The Lord Chancellor also dissented from the opinion that a public trustee, if appointed, would prove a failure.

The present Bill was drafted on the model of an Act which had been in force in the colony of New Zealand for upwards of thirty years and, having been amended from time to time, had been found to be of the greatest advantage. It had never involved the taxpayers in any cost, but, on the contrary, had yielded a slight revenue. He recognised the feeling of this country against any excess of officialism, and the force of the criticism that if a public trustee proved to be a despotic, troublesome, or inaccessible official, or became otherwise a failure, it would be a serious matter. Therefore there was a distinct provision in the Bill that if the public trustee were found not to be advantageous to the public the office should be abolished; but with the experience of New Zealand before them, and in view of the absolute necessity of something being done to put an end to the incessant breaches of trust which were constantly occurring, he confidently anticipated its successful working. Practically this was the same Bill as that which was introduced by the Lord Chancellor and passed through all its stages in the House of Lords in 1890. He did not pretend to say that this Bill as it stood would please all the lawyers, but if the House passed the Second Reading by way of expressing sympathy with the unfortunate people who were suffering from breaches of trust, it could be referred to the Committee on Law for such amendment as might be deemed necessary to meet any effective criticism of detail. The result, he felt sure, would be a Bill which would be of the greatest assistance to the public at large without imposing any burden on the Exchequer. He would not detain the House by going into any details; he would only say he was most anxious to meet any objections which might be made and to accept any modifications which the Government or the Attorney-General thought necessary, so long as they did something to get rid of that evil which this Bill was introduced to remedy.

MR. FORDE RIDLEY (Bethnal Green, S.W.) formally seconded.

Bill read a second time and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (COMPANIES) BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

*Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.), in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said he introduced it officially at the instance of the Municipal Corporations' Association, as its President, and of the London Chamber of Commerce, by which it had been drawn, and that it was intended to remedy an injustice in regard to the local franchise. At present the municipal franchise was based upon the occupancy and rating of a building either joint or several irrespective of value, and there had been in recent years a very great change in the conduct of businesses. Businesses were now largely passing from the hands of individuals to the hands of mercantile and trading companies, but those companies could not exercise the municipal franchise and had no voice in the management of local affairs, although they often carried on the largest businesses, had the greatest risk and responsibility, and contributed greatly to local taxation. That was an indefensible position, and these large trading corporations ought to have some voice in local affairs in order that they might protect their own interests and advance the interests of the community. If an individual occupied property he had one vote, and if a private firm occupied property each of the members had a vote, irrespective of the value of the property, provided that he was rated. The proposal of the Bill was simply that where there was taxation there should be representation, and that a trading company in these circumstances should have one vote, to be exercised by a responsible officer. The absolute exclusion of mercantile and trading companies from the local affairs of the district in which they traded and had considerable interests was injurious to the community, and on that ground that portion of the Bill was recommended by its promoters to the House. The only other point to which he would draw attention was the extension of the radius in which a person must reside to qualify as a councillor. Under the Municipal Corporations Act of 1882 the councillor was compelled to reside within fifteen miles of the district which he served, but new means of locomotion had revolutionised the radius of residence, and it was now suggested that the limit should be extended. He begged to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) was sorry he could not allow the Bill to pass without some discussion. No doubt it was a very simple measure. Its object was to give corporations in a local district a right to vote, which they did not possess at the present time. It did appear at the first glance as if some hardship existed in that respect, but he need not remind the House that in their individual capacity shareholders were able to bring local pressure to bear on the local governing authorities. The first objection he had to the Bill was that it proposed to enfranchise property as against the individual. The whole tendency of modern political thought was to give power to the individual rather than to the corporation, because the component parts of the corporation already exercised such power in an individual capacity. In that respect this Bill was, then, a retrograde measure, and he could not give it his support. He would like to point out what possibilities it opened up for all kinds of manœuvring with regard to elections. If it were passed he would undertake to carry any election in any part of the country providing he cared to spend enough money on it. He would immediately form a corporation. He had only to pay £10. In one particular district he might register 500 corporations, and by that means secure enough power to control the whole municipal machinery. This proposal amounted practically to handing over the power of local control to persons with the largest wealth, and under these circumstances he begged to move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, W.R., Cleveland) said the general idea of the Bill was one to which he did not offer any profound objection, but the measure did contain some very objectionable features. It would give a vote to corporations in respect of any premises they might have in their possession, and consequently under its provisions the Aerated Bread Company, with its fifty or sixty shops in a single district, would be entitled to as many votes and have them under its own control.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT: May I point out that as in the case of the individual only one vote could be recorded. At any rate that is my intention, and if the Bill does not secure that I will consent to any alteration in that direction.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said the Bill clearly did not provide that, but if the modification were accepted it would of course remove his objection to the Bill as far as that point was concerned. He agreed with the last speaker that the tendency should be to give the voting power to individuals and personalities rather than to corporations which could not exercise to the full the higher functions and duties of citizenship. It should not be the property which voted, it should be the man. It should not be the railway company, or the telephone company, who chose the men to carry on the business of the community, it should be the inhabitants of the district in whom the power should be vested.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.' "—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield), looked on the Bill as quite an innovation, and thought it was a rather late hour in the day to spring it upon the House. The point to be considered was not merely the effect the measure would have upon municipal elections. There was a great principle at stake—were corporations qualified to vote? The voting was by ballot; how could a corporation vote by ballot?

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT: An officer is to be appointed under the seal of the company to record the vote.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said an officer was to be appointed to record the vote, but what security had they that he would vote as directed by the corporation. It was contrary to all ideas of voting that anybody should give somebody else the power of voting for them. That was a principle quite new to law, and he objected to its being passed in this way. As a rule corporations were, or ought to be, represented by their individual members. In towns where large corporations were situated many people interested in them also resided, and were able to exercise enormous influence, and he did not think there was the least necessity for anybody to be anxious lest these rich corporations should be short of influence or power at election times. The tendency to-day was for those great aggregations of wealth to get too much power, and there was no need to give them more. The Bill introduced a new and injurious principle in our electoral system, and on that ground he should vote against it.

*MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) thought the grievance of the hon. Member in charge of the Bill was imaginary rather than real. Every member of corporations such as the measure referred to already had a vote, and therefore could not claim to be unrepresented. Now he resided in a borough (Holborn) where a large proportion of the councillors lived outside the borough area. But they were all tradesmen carrying on business within the area, and they represented on the council their business interests rather than the interests of those who actually lived and slept in the constituency. They, he submitted, had a very considerable grievance, because such men did not know what the real requirements of the inhabitants were as regards health and sanitation. This Bill was a piece of retrograde legislation. The legislation of this country for the last seventy years had been in an opposite direction to that embodied in the Bill; it had been in the direction of reducing the property qualification, of minimising the influence of property as opposed to personal representation of individual citizens. This Bill would enormously increase the qualification of property, and would give undue influence to brewery, railway, and bread companies. He strongly objected to this plurality of voting, and he also looked on the proposal of the Bill as entirely contrary to the spirit of the ballot, for unless the nominee of the corporation could vote openly there would be no guarantee as to his voting as directed, and if he voted as a nominee the value of the ballot would be impaired. So a system would arise which from many points of view would work mischief throughout the United Kingdom.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) was surprised that so far-seeing a politician as the hon. Member for South Islington should have brought in a measure of that kind at an hour when it was impossible to subject it to that searching examination which such an innovation demanded. He objected to the Bill very strongly, and was astonished that so advanced a municipal reformer should have lent his weight to it. He could conceive that the Bill, if passed into law, would lead to gerrymandering all over the country and would produce great injustice to the community. He would take but one illustration. When the London County Council wanted to take over forty-eight miles of tramways on the other side of London parties were so evenly divided that the municipalisation of the lines was lost by one vote only. In fact many important questions were determined by a narrow majority, and if they were to give the Aerated Bread Company, Salmon and Gluckstein, the British Tea-Table Company, the Licensed Victuallers' Company (which had tied houses in nearly every constituency), and similar companies this voting power they would simply be handing over the municipal destinies of some of the London boroughs into the hands of impersonal wealth, which, in deciding public questions, would not consider the public weal in the first place. If there was to be an alteration in the franchise it ought to be effected by a public Bill, and in circumstances when the question could be satisfactorily gone into by representative men on both sides of the House. In America they saw the danger arising from great trusts; they saw how they dominated the life of a community. They did not wish that state of affairs extended to this country. Already wealth, in the matter of representation, had a commanding and dominating influence in our elections; the constitution of the House itself afforded proof of it.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT said he would be quite satisfied to defer to the feeling of the House on the Bill and would withdraw the Motion for the Second Reading.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he thought that when the hon. Member was seized with the iniquity of his proposal he would adopt that course.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Motion and Bill, by leave, withdrawn. *Mr. John Burns.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Motion for the Adjournment.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): May I ask what are the proposals of the Government with reference to the Navy Estimates next week? Am I to understand that the Government will be content to get Mr. Speaker out of the Chair on Monday, and to resume consideration of the Estimates in Committee at some later date?

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): And may I ask what will be the business at the morning sittings on Tuesday and Wednesday? Also what it is proposed to do on Thursday?

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington): The business on Monday will be to move Mr. Speaker out of the Chair on the Navy Estimates. The Secretary to the Admiralty will make his usual statement at the commencement of business. If he is fortunate enough to get the Speaker out of the Chair on Monday, Vote I. will be taken in Committee on Thursday. On Tuesday and Wednesday, as at present arranged, the main business will be the Supplementary Estimates already presented to the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to the Reserve Forces." [Reserve Forces Bill [Lords.]

Adjourned at twenty-nine minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 6th March, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Barrymore Estate (Petition for Bill): Caledonian Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.]; Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Medway and Thames Canal Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. Ordered, That the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 3rd instant discharged, and Bill committed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF ADMIRALTY.

Statement showing present distribution of business between the various members of the Board of Admiralty, dated 20th October, 1904; and that which is superseded, dated 1st January, 1904.

Order in Council, dated 10th August, 1904, showing designations of the various members and secretaries to the Board, and the definition of the business to be assigned to them.

NAVAL WORKS.

Memorandum showing progress and expenditure, etc., on items included in the Naval Works Act.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3327. Belgium (Antwerp).

CHURCH ESTATES COMMISSION.

Fifty-fourth Report from the Church Estates Commissioners, for the year preceding 1st March, 1905.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES (IRELAND).

Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland, for the year ended 31st March, 1904, together with the account for the above period and that from 26th July, 1869 (the date of the Irish Church Act) to 31st March, 1904.

SEA AND COAST FISHERIES FUND (IRELAND) (NON-CONGESTED DISTRICTS).

Account for the year ended 31st December, 1904.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

CONTINUATION SCHOOLS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, with respect to school attendance and to secure further attendance under certain conditions at evening continuation schools, classes, or courses of instruction. Was presented by the Lord Bishop of Hereford; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 20.)

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS: My Lords, it is quite unnecessary for me to trouble your Lordships with any description of this Bill. It has been carried without opposition through your Lordships' House in two succeeding sessions, but stress of work in the other House prevented its becoming law. The only difference between this Bill and the one which I had the honour of introducing in previous sessions is that this Bill has been shorn of one clause which it was found possible to effect by Order in Council. If any explanation of the Bill is desired I shall be pleased to give it.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Bishop of St. Albans.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

MR. WYNDHAM'S RESIGNATION.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: My Lords, before your Lordships separate I should like to ask the noble Marquess the Leader of the House if he has any information to give us with reference to the Chief Secretaryship to the Lord-Lieutenant.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): I believe it is generally known that the resignation of the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant has been announced this evening. The Prime Minister stated in another place that the resignation had been tendered to him with so much insistence by the Chief Secretary that he found it impossible not to accept it.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 6th March, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

KING'S SPEECH (ANSWER TO ADDRESS).

The COMPTROLLER of the HOUSEHOLD reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address, as followeth:—

"I have received with great satisfaction the loyal and dutiful expression of your thanks for the Speech with which I have opened the present session of Parliament."

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 62 has been complied with, viz.:—South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 63 has been complied with, viz.:—Brentwood Gas Bill; Chelsea Electricity Supply Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Aylesbury Gas Bill; Clay Cross Railway (Abandonment) Bill; Croydon Gas Bill; Great Berkhampstead Gas Bill; Hitchin and District Gas Bill; Norwich Union Life Insurance Society Bill; Sunderland and South Shields Water Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.

"To authorise the North British Railway Company to construct certain new railways; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING ACT, 1902.

Petition from Manchester and Salford, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING ACTS.

Petition from East Somerset, for alteration of Law ; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CHURCH ESTATES COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Fifty-fourth Report from the Church Estates Commissioners for the year preceding 1st March, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SEA AND COAST FISHERIES FUND (IRELAND) (NON-CONGESTED DISTRICTS).

Account presented, for the year ended 31st December, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1905-6 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).

Estimate presented, showing the several Services for which a Vote on Account is required for the year ending 31st March, 1906 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No 72.]

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th February; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 73.]

BOARD OF ADMIRALTY.

Copy presented, of Order in Council dated 10th August, 1904, showing designations of the various Members of and Secretaries to the Board of Admiralty and the definition of the Business to be assigned to them [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF ADMIRALTY.

Copy presented, of Statement showing present distribution of Business between the various Members of the Board of Admiralty, dated 20th October, 1904, and that which it superseded, dated 1st January, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL WORKS.

Copy presented, of Memorandum showing Progress and Expenditure, etc., on Items included in the Naval Works Act [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (VESSELS STRUCK OFF EFFECTIVE LIST).

Return (in part) presented, relative thereto (Classification of Ships affected by the re-distribution of the Fleet since October last as will be shown in Appendix B of the Dockyard Expense Accounts, 1903–4) (Part I.) [ordered 22nd February; *Mr. Edmund Robertson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 74.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3327 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Church Temporalities (Ireland).—Copy of Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General upon the Account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1904 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 75.]

FLEETS (GREAT BRITAIN AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Return ordered, "showing the Fleets of Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Italy, United States of America, and Japan, distinguishing :—Battleships, built and building; Cruisers, built and building; Coast Defence Vessels, built and building; Torpedo Vessels, Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Torpedo Boats, and Submarines, built and building."

"Return to show Date of Launch, Displacement, and Armaments reduced to one common scale (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 136, of Session 1904)."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

South African War—Outstanding Claims against Transvaal and Orange River Colony

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can give a statement of the various claims outstanding against the Transvaal and Orange River Governments since the close of the war on account of the railways and other matters, exclusive of the promised war contribution, and the terms of settlement agreed upon by the Treasury in each case; when will the payment be made; how is the money to be raised; and will it, when received, be applied to the reduction of debt.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The following statement shows how the outstanding claims of His Majesty's Government against the Transvaal and Orange River Governments have been settled :—

	Amount originally claimed.	Amount of claim disallowed or of counterclaim allowed.	Amount finally agreed as payable by Colony.
	£	£	£
1. War Office Railway Claim - -	1,250,000	750,000	500,000
2. Claim for animals, stores, etc. sold to New Colonies - -	928,809	171,809	757,000
3. Miscellaneous claims, rations to burgher camps, etc. - - -	443,335	252,432	190,903
	2,622,144	1,174,241	1,447,903

Payment of the sums due to His Majesty's Government will be made during the month of March to the amount of £1,257,000. Of the total amount due all will be applied to the reduction of debt with the exception of £145,000 payable to the War Office. It is understood that the whole or nearly the whole sum will be paid out of the balance of the Guaranteed Loan and other Colonial Funds in the hands of the Crown Agents.

Disturbances amongst Chinese Coolies in the Transvaal.

MR. BELL (Derby): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any new regulations have been issued by the Transvaal Government on account of the increasing number of riots and disturbances amongst the Chinese indentured coolies on the Rand goldfields; and, if so, will he state what they are.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) There is not an increasing number of riots and disturbances among the Chinese. The only new regulation is that published in the *Government Gazette* of January 27th, requiring prompt information to be given to the Foreign Labour Department in case of disturbance, about which I was asked a Question on the 2nd instant.† Lord Milner informs me that there has been no disturbance lately worth mentioning.

Punishment for Refractory Chinese Labourers.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the number of cat-o'-nine-tails provided for the flogging of refractory Chinese indentured labourers in the Transvaal mines; by whom and under what conditions are these floggings inflicted, and what is the maximum, if any, of the number of lashes which may be inflicted; what is the weight of these cat-o'-nine-tails, and are they made on the model of the cat-o'-nine-tails supplied to ships of His Majesty's Navy or on what other model.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) There are no cat-o'-nine-tails. The maximum of strokes inflicted with a cane, which is the instrument of whipping, would be twenty-four. The whipping would be given in the presence of the governor or deputy-governor of the prison, and the goaler, and the visiting medical officer, who certifies to the fitness of the prisoner to undergo the punishment. The sentence being by a magistrate cannot be carried out till the record has been sent to and confirmed by a Judge of the High Court.

Congo Commission of Inquiry.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will His Majesty's Government request by cable the British Consul at Boma for a full report from Mr. A. E. Scrivener at Bolobo, Mr. A. Billington at Bwemba, Mr. Gilcriest at Lolanga, Mr. Weeks at Mensembe, Mr. Joseph Clarke at Lkeko, and Mr. Ruskin at Bongandanga, of their depositions before the Commission of Inquiry, together with the substance of the evidence laid before the Commission by native witnesses produced by these gentlemen.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The Commission of Inquiry has not yet issued its Report, and we do not know to what extent notes of the evidence will be published with it. There should be no difficulty in procuring the information asked for if the published evidence is insufficient.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is His Majesty's Government aware that a number of native witnesses to outrages committed in the Baringa region were, at the instance of the British missionaries at that place and at the request of the *Substitut* of the *Procureur d'Etat*, sent down last August to Boma, involving a journey there and back of three months; can His Majesty's Government give any indication of the treatment these native witnesses are receiving at Boma; and will His Majesty's Government request the British Consul to inform them by cable on the subject.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) I am not aware of any recent occurrence of the character described.

The Congo Free State.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has the intention of His Majesty's Government been drawn to the published notes of the Rev. W. T. Currie, of Livingstonia, British Central Africa, on his recent experiences in travelling through the Lualaba country in the Congo Free State; and will His Majesty's Government, in view of the general condition of oppression and ill-treatment of the natives reported by Mr. Currie, request the authorities of the British Central Africa Protectorate to obtain a detailed report from that gentleman for the information of this House.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) We have not heard of the report alluded to. I will ascertain from the Colonial Office whether it is possible to obtain the information desired.

---

† See page 181.

Employment of Women after Childbirth.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the restrictions on the employment of women before and after childbirth prevailing in foreign countries, so far as they are known to the Foreign Office.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The latest information in the possession of the Foreign Office is contained in the "Further Correspondence respecting the International Labour Conference at Berlin," Commercial (No. 10, 1890). The Secretary of State will be happy to bring the information up to date if the right hon. Member desires it.

Publication of Irish Franciscan MSS.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state what steps have been taken towards the publication of the Irish Franciscan MSS. by the Historical MSS. Commission; and when it is expected that these MSS. will be published.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The Manuscript of the Irish Franciscan MSS. is now in the hands of the printers, and I hope that the Report will be published very shortly

Retirement of War Office Abstractor Class Clerks.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that the Treasury, in December, 1904, informed the War Office that the ages for retirement of those temporary copyists selected for beneficial promotion to the established abstractor class were to be sixty-five and seventy years, and that this Treasury decision was to be applied retrospectively to temporary copyists so appointed since 1890 to the War Office, he will now cause the three War Office abstractor class clerks compulsorily retired from that office at the respective ages of sixty, sixty-two, and sixty, while efficient and with less than forty years of service, to receive the benefits intended by this Treasury decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) Full discretion rests with the Department concerned to call upon any officer to retire upon reaching the age of sixty or upwards. With that discretion I have no power nor wish to interfere.

Removal of Wrecks off Irish Coast—Damage to Fishing Gear.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the Irish Government was first requested to remove the wreck of the "Albert" which lies off Blackwater, in the county of Wexford; which of the Irish Departments is responsible for the removal of wrecks; and whether he will consider the advisability of giving compensation to the local fishermen for the injuries done to their fishing gear for several years past by this wreck, which lies directly in the fishing channel.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) Under the provisions of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, it would appear to be the duty of either the harbour or conservancy authorities, or of the general lighthouse authority for the district, and not of the Irish Government, to provide for the removal of the wreck in question.

Promotion of Assistant Clerks (Abstractor Class).

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state how many promotions have been made under Clause 15 of the Order in Council, November 27th, 1898, from assistant clerks of the abstractor class to the second division, and how many of these in the Custom House.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) Number of promotions of assistant clerks (abstractors) under Clause 15 of the Order in Council of November 29th, 1898:—

Old Class (former men copyists)	141
New class (recruited by competition among boy clerks) - -	34
In the Customs Department:—	
Old Class - - - - -	1
New class - - - - -	0

The Customs Department does not now employ second division clerks, but seven abstractors have been promoted to analogous positions.

Duties and Remuneration of Customs Watchers.

Mr. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he has carried out the promise made by him last session to look into the questions raised on behalf of the Customs watchers; and, if so, will he state whether he has taken or will take steps to accede to their requests.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The questions raised in the last session as to the duties and remuneration of Customs watchers have not been lost sight of; but I am not yet in a position to make a statement on the subject.

Armagh Post Office—Case of Mr. M'Cusker.

Mr. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a sorting clerk and telegraphist named M'Clusker, stationed at Armagh, has been for a number of years subjected to discomfort through the action of certain of his immediate superior officers, and that in at least one case brought against him and for which he was punished, the preponderance of expert evidence was on the side of M'Clusker; and, if so, whether he will make personal inquiries into the whole of the facts of the difficulties between M'Clusker and his superiors.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I presume that the hon. Member's Question refers to Mr. R. J. M'Cusker (not M'Clusker), a sorting clerk and telegraphist at the Armagh Post Office. I have no reason to think that Mr. M'Cusker has been subjected to discomfort through the action of certain of his immediate superior officers, nor am I prepared to reopen the disciplinary case to which the hon. Member appears to refer, seeing that it occurred in 1897.

Risk Allowances in the Post Office.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the Branch Office Circular 171 of December, 1902, stated that risk allowances were to be paid on newly created counter duties, and that the staff at Ludgate Circus Branch Office, who petitioned in 1902, were informed in December, 1904, that the matter was still under consideration, he intends to give effect to the instructions contained in that circular.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The arrangement sanctioned in December, 1902, was duly carried out, and it is not the case, as the hon. Member appears to think, that the matter now under consideration has any reference to the decision then given Certain new duties were created at the Ludgate Circus Office in November last, and it is the amount of risk attending those particular duties, and consequently the proper amount of risk allowance to be granted to the officers performing the duties, which is now under consideration. A decision will be given as soon as possible.

Parliamentary Grants to Elementary Schools—Physical Condition of Children.

Sir JOHN GORST: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether a provision will be inserted in the new Code making the payment of Parliamentary grants to public elementary schools conditional upon the Board of Education being satisfied by medical inspection or otherwise that the children in respect of whom the grant is made are physically fit to receive the instruction for which the grant is paid.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) It is extremely doubtful if the Board have the legal power to require the medical inspection of children in public elementary schools. Even if they do possess such power, the right hon. Member hardly seems to have realised what the effect of their putting it into operation would be. The organisation of any such system as is suggested in the Question must take some time to complete, and in the meanwhile the public elementary schools throughout the country would be deprived of Government grants. The Board do not propose to insert any such provision in the new Code.

Cutting of the Hair of Prisoners Awaiting Trial.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch Hoxton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the recent case of a female prisoner having had her hair cut while awaiting trial; and whether he will state what steps he has taken in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) Careful inquiry was made into the case as soon as attention was called to it (which was done by the girl's father on February 20th), and I find that sanitary considerations rendered the cutting of the hair necessary. The woman was examined on reception by the deputy medical officer of the prison, who found her hair to be verminous, and gave written directions authorising it to be cut. Dr. Quinton, the governor, himself a medical man of great experience, is satisfied from the deputy medical officer's account and from the report of the hospital officer that no other measures would have eradicated the dirt and vermin without seriously injuring the scalp. In the interests of other prisoners it is necessary to take prompt and effectual precautions in cases of this kind, but a woman's hair is never cut except when there is no possibility of cleansing it in any other way, and then only on the certificate of a medical officer.

Marine Works in County Mayo.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in proceeding with the marine works in county Mayo; and whether there is any prospect of their being commenced in the near future.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) Negotiations are still in progress with respect to these works. I am not, therefore, in a position to reply to the second inquiry.

Relief Works—County Mayo.

Dr. AMBROSE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that distress prevails in the districts around Newport, county Mayo; and if he will explain why relief works have not been started there.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Local Government Board have approved of schemes prepared by the Westport Board of Guardians for the relief of distress in the Achill and Ballycroy divisions of the union, and relief works in these divisions were, I understand, to be opened to-day.

Mr. Jones' Estate at Burrishoole, County Mayo.

Dr. AMBROSE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Jones, of Burrishoole, Newport, county Mayo, is anxious to sell his estate to the Congested Districts Board; that he has been in negotiation with the Board with a view to sell such estate; that those negotiations have been broken off; and if he can state why those negotiations were broken off.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The negotiations between Mr. Anketell Jones and the Board have not been broken off.

Kerry County Council Audit.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the action of the Local Government Board, taken on the report of their auditor, Mr. Browne, in drawing the attention of the Valuation Office to the present position in connection with the Limerick and Kerry Railway, has resulted in a loss of £486 12s. 4d. of the amount payable to the County Council of Kerry out of the Local Taxation (Ireland) Act, he will take any steps to prevent such loss, having regard to the fact that the Under-Secretary, on January 16th last, No. 637, wrote to the Council that the apportionment of the proceeds of the purchase of the Limerick and Kerry Railway was duly and legally made.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The county council in the year 1903 applied portion of the sum received under the Limerick and Kerry Railway Act in reduction of the rate estimates for charges on the guaranteeing baronies alone, and thereby received from the Local Taxation Account a larger contribution, to the extent of £486 12s. 4d., than they were legally entitled to. In the year 1904 the county council adopted a different procedure, and apportioned part of the purchase-money in relief of the general rates. The letter of the Under-Secretary of January 16th last, in addition to intimating that the apportionment of the proceeds of the purchase of the Limerick and Kerry Railway for the year 1904 was duly and legally made, further stated that the sum of £5,225 7s. 2d. was subject to a deduction of £486 12s. 4d., to be refunded in respect of the back payments previously made by the Government to the county council in respect of the Limerick and Kerry Railway Company guarantee, as the result of previous apportionment of part of the purchase money in reduction of the rate estimates for charges on the guaranteeing baronies.

Land Purchase Act, 1903.

Mr. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state up to what amount of purchase money have agreements been lodged in the Land Commission under the Land Purchase Act of 1903 up to March 1st; up to what amount of money have sales actually been completed; how much money has actually been paid to owners on foot of their estates under the Land Act of 1903; what is the balance required to finance the Act; and if the Government propose to make any arrangement to speed sales by providing all the money required for sales which are pending.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) Agreements have been lodged to February 28th for advances amounting to over £16,900,000. Advances have been made to purchasers in receipt of completed sales to the amount of £4,630,000. The amount paid to owners cannot be stated without an investigation which would involve considerable delay; but the amount of purchase money distributed to claimants on estates sold is between £3,500,000 and £4,000,000. My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated on 1st instant† that the two issues of stock, amounting to £11,000,000, are expected to yield cash to a total amount of £9,691,421 6s. 8d. All reasonable steps are being taken to complete sales in the cases of agreements already lodged.

Irish Teachers' Pension Fund.

Mr. FFRENCH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a meeting of teachers recently held in Wexford protesting against the allocation of the Equivalent Grant to purposes other than the promotion and extension of primary education, and requesting the Government to place the Teachers' Pension Fund on a sound financial basis; and, if so, will he state what steps, if any, the Government will take during the present session to meet the wishes of the teachers.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) I have seen a report of the proceedings at the meeting referred to. The question of the allocation in Ireland of the amount provided as an equivalent of the aid grant for education in England has been frequently discussed in this House. The Government have no further statement to make in the matter at present. The hon. Member's inquiry respecting the Teachers' Pension Fund should be addressed to my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury.

Adaptation of Existing Long Rifle for Clip Loading.

Sir JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to adapt the existing long rifles for clip loading.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) All rifles will be supplied with the clip loading. The question whether all the long rifles so fitted need also be shortened is still under consideration.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Clio" and "Cadmus."

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty on what date were His Majesty's ships "Clio" and "Cadmus" laid down; when were they completed; what was their cost; and whether it is now proposed to remove them from the active list as being obsolete.

---

† See page 16.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The "Clio" and "Cadmus" were both laid down on March 11th, 1902. The "Clio" was completed in January and the "Cadmus" in April of 1904. The first cost of these vessels is as follows: "Clio," £80,796; "Cadmus," £76,657. They were never designed for fighting purposes but for subsidiary work in peace or war, for which they are still available, and in which they are at the present moment engaged.

Effective and Non-Effective Ships—Return.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the promised Returns relating to ships struck off the effective list and to cruisers not so struck off will be in the hands of Members before the discussion of the Navy Estimates in Committee of Supply.

*MR. PRETYMAN: The information asked for by the hon. Member will take some time to prepare, but I hope that it may be in the hands of Members during the next fortnight.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will the further discussion on the Navy Estimates be postponed till then?

*MR. PRETYMAN: That is a Question I am not able to answer.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Can the hon. Gentleman give us the number of ships?

*MR. PRETYMAN: I must ask for notice of that.

Admiralty Administration.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will undertake to circulate copies of the Order in Council of August 10th, 1904, relating to the distribution of business at the Admiralty, before the discussion of the Navy Estimates begins in Committee of Supply.

*MR. PRETYMAN: This Paper is being laid on the Table to-day, and will be circulated in due course.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: When will it be circulated?

*MR. PRETYMAN; To-morrow, I hope.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Can the hon. Gentleman explain why that Order in Council alone of all the Admiralty Orders in Council has not been sent to the Library?

*MR. PRETYMAN: I was not aware of the fact. I regret it.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the hon. Gentleman defer his statement until the Order has been circulated?

[No Answer was returned.]

H.M.S. "Harrier" and "Barham."

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the speed of the "Harrier" gunboat, and the cruiser "Barham;" when did they commence fishery duties; and what waters do they respectively control.

*MR. PRETYMAN: The speed at authorised natural draught of the "Harrier" is 16·4 knots per hour, and that of the "Barham" 18·7 knots per hour. These vessels commenced duties in charge of fisheries in Scottish waters and in the North Sea on February 13th and 4th respectively.

Naval Works Bill.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether a Naval Works Bill is to be introduced this year, and when.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARTHUR LEE, Hampshire, Fareham): A Naval Works Loan Bill will be introduced this year, and is now in course of preparation. It is not at present possible to say on what date it will be introduced.

Naval Works Expenditure.

MR. BUCHANAN: I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty what is the amount of money spent during the current year, and the estimated amount to be spent during the ensuing year, under the Naval Works Acts.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: The amount of money spent under the Naval Works Acts during the current year is estimated at £3,589,600. The estimated amount to be spent during the ensuing year cannot at present be stated, but will be included in the forthcoming Naval Works Loan Bill.

The New Rifle.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what orders have been given for the new pattern short rifle and where those orders have been placed, also the number of these rifles already manufactured and the number already issued.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Orders have been placed as follows: New rifle, B.S.A. Company, 70,000; L.S.A. Company, 35,000; Sparkbrook, 19,000; Enfield Lock, 98,000; converted rifle, Sparkbrook, 25,000; Enfield Lock, 39,500. 158,000 short rifles have been already manufactured; and 130,000 have been issued to date.

Submarine Mining.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what (if any) course is intended to be taken with reference to the Militia and Volunteer Submarine Mining Divisions (R.E.) stationed on the Humber, Tyne, Clyde, and at other commercial harbours; and, if submarine mining is to be discontinued, what, if any, provision will be made as to the services of the officers and men of such divisions.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Submarine mining in the estuaries and harbours of the United Kingdom will be discontinued. The question of how the services of officers and men who have hitherto been engaged on submarine work can be best utilised, therefore, becomes a matter for consideration.

West Indian Garrisons.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is decided that all white infantry are to be removed from the West Indies, Demerara, and Honduras; and, if so, by what date; where in future will artillery be stationed, and in what numbers; what naval force is contemplated to be permanently stationed in the district, and what probable landing force a cruiser or gunboat could respectively supply; whether any direct telegraph communication connects the chief islands with Demerara and Honduras; and whether His Majesty's Government are proposing to improve or add to the present system.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): It has been decided to withdraw all the white infantry from the West Indian Islands, but the date has not yet been settled. No white infantry has been stationed in British Guiana or British Honduras for many years past. It has not yet been finally decided what artillery will be retained or where it will be stationed. Adequate naval force will be stationed in the district. It is not desirable in the public interest to give further details. There is telegraph communication between the islands and British Guiana. There is no telegraph communication between them and British Honduras. The subject of West Indian telegraphs has recently engaged the attention of His Majesty's Government, but it is not proposed to incur any Imperial expenditure on this account at the present time.

Chinese Labourers and Trade Unions.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is anything in the terms of their indenture which makes it illegal for Chinamen in the Transvaal to form a trade union or a secret society.

MR. LYTTELTON: The terms of the indenture contain nothing bearing upon the point raised.

Tibetan Treaty—Chinese Plenipotentiary.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether Mr. Tang Shao Yi has been appointed Chinese

Plenipotentiary to negotiate with the Government the terms of the Tibetan Treaty, and is now at Calcutta; and whether he has been appointed Chinese Ambassador to the British Government.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Mr. Tang Shao Yi has been appointed Plenipotentiary by the Chinese Government for the purposes of the negotiations at Calcutta regarding the Tibetan Treaty. Mr. Tang, I understand, has arrived at Calcutta. Mr. Tang has been appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at this Court.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: With whom will you negotiate?

MR. BRODRICK: The negotiations have to take place with the Suzerain Power.

Indian Police Commission Report.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what steps were taken to obtain the views of the Indian public on the measures recommended by the Police Commission Report before the Secretary of State passed his decisions on the subject; and whether, before the Government of India state their conclusions upon the question, the public and the Press in India will be informed as to what these recommendations are, and will have an opportunity of expressing their views upon them.

MR. BRODRICK: The Report of the Indian Police Commission was founded upon an exhaustive inquiry carried out in public, the evidence given at which, by a very large number of persons, unofficial as well as official, was published in the newspapers at the time. The decisions which have already been arrived at relate to questions of establishment, pay, and organisation, in regard to which the Government considered that they already had sufficient information before them. Other recommendations contained in the Report will require legislation to give effect to them, and, as the hon. Member is aware, the ordinary course of legislation in India fully secures to persons interested an opportunity of expressing their views on the questions to which it relates.

Outrages by Congolese Soldiers—Treatment of Witnesses.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is His Majesty's Government aware that a number of native witnesses to outrages committed by Congolese soldiers in Ikeko were, at the instances of missionaries in that district and at the request of the investigating magistrate, sent down to Boma; and will His Majesty's Government instruct the British Consul at that place to report by cable as to the allegations that these native witnesses are virtually kept as prisoners, and have in some cases been compelled to labour on behalf of the Congo Government.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): No Sir, we have no information on the subject. If the hon. Member will acquaint me with the source of the allegations I will make inquiry.

Canadian Government Whisky Age Guarantees.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been directed to the practice of the Canadian Government in granting certificates, on the payment of a small stamp duty, to distillers and merchants endorsing the age guarantee affixed by such traders to pot-still whiskies bottled in bond, as the Excise officers know by the official books the exact time such whiskies have been in Government custody; and, if so, whether, in the interest of trade, the public health, and increase of the revenue, he will instruct the Excise authorities to adopt a similar practice in these countries.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I have not sufficient information as to the Canadian practice in this matter, but I will ask the Colonial Office to obtain a full report upon the subject.

Public Buildings Expenses Act, 1898, Fund.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, what is the amount of Consols sold from the Public Buildings Expenses Act, 1898, Fund since February 8th, 1904; what was the average price obtained for those sales; what was the loss incurred; and what is the amount of Consols left.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Consols sold from the Public Buildings Expenses Act, 1898, Fund since February 8th, 1904, amount to £433,477 12s. 8d.; the average price obtained was £88·526; and the loss on these transactions was £90,804 17s. 11d. The amount of Consols now held for the Fund is £397,693 4s. 6d.

Post Office—Agreement with National Telephone Company.

MR. COHEN: On behalf of my right hon. friend the Member for the City of London, I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any estimate has yet been arrived at of the sum of money that will be payable to the National Telephone Company for the purchase by the Postmaster-General of their undertaking in 1911, under the agreement of February 2nd, 1905; and, if so, what is the amount of the estimate; and whether he will alter the Notice of Motion standing in his name with regard to the reference of that agreement to a Select Committee, so as to give local authorities and others interested the right to be heard by counsel or otherwise before the Select Committee.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The price to be paid to the National Telephone Company for plant in 1911 must depend on many things, including the maintenance of the plant in the meantime and the expansion of the system. It is impossible, therefore, to estimate at the present time the amount to be paid to the company. The committee will have power to send for persons, papers, and records, and can take any evidence they may consider necessary. I do not think any further directions necessary.

Foreign Ships and Statutory Law.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade when it is intended to re-appoint the Select Committee on the application of Statutory Powers to Foreign Ships.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): As soon as possible.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake to receive a deputation on the subject?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot possibly say that.

Sugar Convention—Appeals to the Brussels Permanent Commission.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what date has been fixed for hearing the appeal of the British Government against the condemnation by the Permanent Commission of the Brussels Convention of the eighteen countries in October last; whether different delegates will be appointed as judges from those who have taken part in the deliberations of the Permanent Commission; what are the grounds on which the British case is based; and whether it will be prepared and laid before the tribunal by the Law Officers of the Crown.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The questions on which His Majesty's Government has lodged an appeal against certain decisions of the Permanent Commission will be re-discussed by that Commission at its next session, which opens on April 6th. The selection of delegates rests entirely with the various Governments. As regards the remainder of the Question, I have nothing to add to the reply given by me on February 16th† to the hon. Member.

MR. LOUGH: Will the same delegates be sent to re-hear the cases?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: That Question should be addressed to the Foreign Office.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 309.

New German Commercial Treaties.

Mr. GRENFELL (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if any steps have been taken to bring to the notice of manufacturers in this country the provisions of the new German commercial treaties.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: A statement showing the effect of these treaties on the new German tariff has been prepared and presented to Parliament and will be circulated in a few days.

Swine Fever Regulations in Ireland.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether he can state when the Swine Fever Order was being promulgated the Irish Department was consulted; if so, can he now say what representation was made by the Irish Department; and, if the Irish Department were opposed to the Order, why was the Order put in force.

*Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): These questions were answered in my printed reply to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for Queen's County on February 20th,† to which I would ask the hon. Gentleman to refer.

Importation of Swine from Ireland.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether it is proposed to continue the present Order in reference to the importation of swine from Ireland for any fixed period, or to revoke same as soon as possible.

Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: It is not possible to fix a period for the continuance of the Swine Fever (Movement from Ireland) Order. Since the Order came into force on January 23rd last, the circumstances which influenced the Board's decision in passing it have not changed. The time, therefore, has not arrived for a reconsideration of the matter.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Did any communications pass between the English and Irish Agricultural Departments on the subject?

Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: Yes, Sir; I am in continual communication with the Irish Department.

Scottish Local Government Board Medical Inspectors.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether he is aware that, although the population of Scotland is slightly in excess of that of Ireland, there is only one medical inspector provided under the Local Government Board Vote for the whole of Scotland, whilst seven such inspectors are provided for Ireland under the Irish Vote; and, seeing that it is quite impossible for one medical inspector to visit the various districts in Scotland requiring his presence, will the question of appointing additional medical inspectors be considered.

*The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton): The facts are as stated in the first part of the hon. Member's Question, but the Secretary for Scotland has no proposals to make at present in the direction suggested.

Physical Deterioration—Advice to Scottish Local Authorities.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if the Secretary for Scotland will consider the expediency of issuing to parochial medical officers, sanitary inspectors and inspectors of poor, leaflets containing the opinions of the Committee on Physical Deterioration relative to ventilation and the bringing up of young children, with a view to the dissemination of information on these subjects.

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: The Secretary for Scotland will consider whether any official communication relative to the Report to which the hon. Member refers, can advisedly be made to the local authorities in Scotland.

Attadale Scholars and the Achintee River.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether he is aware that, as there is no footbridge or other means of crossing the Achintee River, children from

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 585.

Strathcarron who attend the Attadale Public School have to walk along the railway line for about 400 yards in order to cross the river by the railway bridge; and, as this practice is attended with risk to their lives, especially having regard to the frequent special trains, will he take such steps as may be necessary to secure the construction of a footbridge.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: This matter appears to be one which is entirely within the powers of the parish council as defined by the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1894, and the Secretary for Scotland is not able to take steps in the direction contemplated by the hon. Member.

Peebleshire County Council Clerk.

MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether, in view of the fact that a considerable portion of the public in Peebleshire strongly object to their servant, the clerk to the county council, for whose salary they are rated, acting as election agent and appearing as paid agent in the Registration Courts for a political Party in connection with the Parliamentary and county roll; and whether, looking to the fact that Peebleshire is the only county where such practice actually prevails, and that every representation for its discontinuance has been persistently ignored, he will introduce a short Amendment to the Local Government (Scotland) Act placing county clerks and their firms, if they be solicitors, on the same neutral footing in respect of politics as thaof procurators-tfiscal.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: I would remind the hon. Member of the Answer given by Mr. Graham Murray to a similar Question on March 14th, † 1904. The Secretary for Scotland is not prepared to introduce special legislation on this subject.

Sub-Land Commission Meeting at Bantry.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to a proposed sitting of the Sub-Land Commission at Bantry on March 7th; whether he is aware that on the list for hearing there are forty-seven cases from the Castletown Berehaven district and only seven from the Bantry district; whether, seeing that in many cases the holdings are forty miles from Bantry, and that the greater number of the holdings are small and the occupiers poor, and that the holding of the Land Court in Bantry for tenants from Castletown Berehaven is calculated to prevent small occupiers from serving originating notices to fix a fair rent, he will direct the Sub-Commission to have a sitting at Berehaven.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I regret I am not in a position to reply to this Question at the present moment. I have referred it to the Land Commissioners and expect to receive their further observations in the matter this afternoon, when I will communicate with the hon. Member.

Kerry Evicted Tenants.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of applications received by the Estates Commissioners from evicted tenants in the county of Kerry; whether any of such applications have been dealt with, and how many tenants have been reinstated through the action of the Commissioners: and whether any proceedings are now in progress to effect the reinstatement of tenants whose farms are unoccupied and in the landlords' possession.

MR. ATKINSON: The number of such applications received is 411. So far as the Commissioners are aware, nineteen evicted tenants have been reinstated by landlords. None have been reinstated by the Commissioners, but the applications are with the inspectors and will be considered with a view to providing the applicants with new holdings on untenanted land in their neighbourhood when such becomes available, or to their reinstatement on former holdings, as the case may be.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxi., 952.

Mr. Collis Sandes' Estate, County Kerry.

Mr. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the legal proceedings taken on the estate of Mr. Collis Sandes at Brosna, county Kerry, against tenants who refused to agree to purchase on terms which they considered excessive; and, if so, whether, seeing that the landlord has publicly stated his readiness to sell, and the tenants to purchase, that the sale is stopped owing to the terms mentioned by the landlord, and that the estate is scheduled as a congested district, the Congested Districts Board, or the Estates Commissioners, are in a position to take any steps to carry out a settlement on reasonable terms on the estate.

Mr. ATKINSON: I have no information that the facts are as stated in the first part of the Question, but I would observe that the Land Act of 1903 does not interfere with, and was not intended to interfere with, any rights possessed by either landlords or tenants in respect of the payment of rent. With regard to the remainder of the Question, I understand that negotiations are in progress between the Congested Districts Board and the tenants, and until these have been concluded I cannot make any further statement in the matter.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the Congested Districts Board take steps to prevent seizures while negotiations are proceeding?

Mr. ATKINSON: I require notice of that. I should wish to know the nature of the proceedings.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants—Case of Mr. Moore.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state upon what grounds the Estates Commissioners have informed Mr. M. Moore, who was evicted from the estate of Lord Lansdowne, Luggacurran, Queen's County, in the year 1887, in reply to his application for reinstatement, that they cannot consider his case as that of an evicted tenant.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Estates Commissioners inform me that an application for reinstatement was received from this man in January last. He stated he was evicted in March, 1887, from a house with a rood of ground, which he had held at a rent of £1 a year. On the facts so stated it appeared to the Commissioners that the holding was not an agricultural holding to which the Land Law Acts applied, and Moore was so informed.

Re-Sale of an Estate at Rochfort Bridge, Mullingar.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the re-sale of an estate of 447 acres at Rochfort Bridge, near Mullingar, the Estates Commissioners have disregarded the expressed wishes of Mrs. Maher, the vendor, that the land should be divided amongst the villagers, and have sanctioned a list of purchasers largely made up of, and furnished by, officials and members of the local branch of the United Irish League, most of whom live several miles distant; and, if so, will he state what communications passed between the Estates Commissioners and the United Irish League, and which of the Commissioners were concerned.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Estates Commissioners inform me that it is not the case that they have disregarded the wishes of Mrs. Maher, who, together with a Mr. McDermott and Mr. Leonard, executors of the will of Mrs. Maher's husband, were the vendors of these lands. The solicitor of the vendors, on July 15th, 1904, furnished to the Estates Commissioners a list of purchasers whom they could recommend, the same being in fact a copy of a list supplied to the vendors by the parish priest with the exception of one person added by the vendors. On September 15th, 1904, the solicitor for the vendors submitted an additional list of purchasers, this latter list being in fact a copy of a list sent on September 8th by the local branch of the United Irish League direct to the office of the Estates Commissioners. Subsequently to September 15th the Commissioners instructed one of their inspectors to inspect the lands and obtain undertakings to purchase from suitable purchasers, with the result that he obtained undertakings from nineteen persons. These nineteen persons comprised eight who were included in the lists previously furnished by the vendors, the parish priest, and the United Irish League; three others whose names were on the list furnished by the vendors and the parish priest; two who were recommended by the parish priest alone; three others who were recommended by the United Irish League alone; and the remaining three who were recommended by the inspector alone. I am informed by the Estates Commissioners that eighteen of these persons live in the immediate vicinity of the lands, and that the remaining person lives three miles distant. The Commissioners also inform me that they themselves had no communication with the United Irish League other than a letter acknowledging the receipt of the above mentioned list. It appears that all three of the Commissioners took part in these proceedings at different stages.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Can the right hon. Gentleman say which of the Commissioners made the order dividing the land?

Mr. ATKINSON: I cannot.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Was one Mr. Wrench?

Mr. ATKINSON: I can give no further information.

Sir J. G. Booth's Estate, County Sligo.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Sir Joselyn Gore Booth, landlord, of Ballymote, county Sligo, has agreed to sell to his town tenants through the Estates Commissioners, but that the latter decline to advance the purchase money, although the estate on which this town is situated has already been sold under the Act of 1903; and, if so, will he state the grounds on which the Commissioners base their refusal of this application.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Land Purchase Acts do not contemplate the sale of towns and villages.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman amplify his Answer. Does he mean to say that the Land Purchase Act in Ireland does not permit the purchase of towns and villages. Is it not the fact that some towns and villages have been purchased?

Mr. ATKINSON: The Land Act was intended for the purchase of agricultural holdings.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: But is the purchase of towns and villages excluded. Is it not the fact that some have already been purchased?

Mr. ATKINSON: It is not expressly excluded. I must ask for notice of the Question whether any towns and villages have been purchased.

Mr. KILBRIDE: Was not Boyne sold under the Act?

[No Answer was returned.]

Higher Education in Ireland.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what is the settlement of the question of higher education in Ireland referred to in his correspondence with Sir Antony MacDonnell, in view of the fact that it is not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation on the subject.

Mr. ATKINSON: I must ask my hon. friend to postpone this Question until my right hon. friend returns to his place.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: When will that be?

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: In the Ides of March.

St. Patrick's Day Celebration at Cookstown.

*Mr. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government has decided to close the county road through the hamlet of Coagh against the Nationalist contingents from the Arboe district to attend the public meeting which is to be held on St. Patrick's Day near Cookstown; whether the Government has been informed by their local advisers that the direct road from Arboe to Cookstown runs through Coagh; that there are precedents for Nationalist processions passing through Coagh since 1879; and that the only alternative road is much longer and passes through several miles of an Orange district; whether he is aware that a Nationalist procession last year passed through an Orange suburb of Dungannon, and the police arrangements were so satisfactory that no disturbance whatever took place; and, if so, whether similar arrangements will be made this year to keep the peace in Coagh, whose population is only 394, instead of depriving the people of a Nationalist district of their right to use the public road.

Mr. ATKINSON: My right hon. friend stated on February 24th † that for the reasons then explained the Government were unable to allow the proposed procession to pass through the village of Coagh. The direct road between Arboe and Cookstown passes through Coagh, and it has been the rule during the past twenty-five years—a rule recognised by both the Orange and Nationalist Parties in the district—that neither Party should march in processional order through the territory of the other Party. The alternative route, to which the same objections do not apply, is only 2½ miles longer than the direct road. On March 17th, 1902, a Nationalist contingent with a flag and drums entered the village of Coagh, and the police experienced the greatest difficulty in safely escorting them out again, with rifles and fixed swords. The practice followed at Dungannon is not to allow either Party, if objected to, to pass through districts claimed by the opposite Party unless it has been the custom to do so, and the arrangements at Dungannon last year were made on this principle.

*Mr. DOOGAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that only a few perches of the road pass through Coagh, while the alternative route is 7 miles longer and runs through several red-hot Orange districts, where the chances of attack will be far greater, and that it would require a much larger force of police to keep the peace?

Mr. ATKINSON: My information does not tally with that.

Comyn Kenney Estate, Galway.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board will let the grazing of the Comyn Kenney Estate to the tenants in the immediate neighbourhood until the estate is vested in the Board.

Mr. ATKINSON: I am informed that the Board have already allowed the tenants in the neighbourhood to graze their cattle on this estate on the terms usual in such cases.

Irish Agricultural Department—Staff Grievances.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, since dissatisfaction exists in the Irish Agricultural Department on account of the inequality in the treatment of its staff, and having regard to the further circumstances that have arisen within the last few weeks, he will cause independent inquiry to be made into the whole matter with a view of ascertaining how far such grievances actually prevail, and further with the object of definitely fixing responsibility for them.

Mr. ATKINSON: The only dissatisfaction that exists, so far as I am aware, is that which has formed the subject of numerous Questions put by the hon. Member. Both the vice-president and the secretary of the Department have made a very careful and extensive inquiry into the matter, and found that there was not the slightest foundation for the suggestion which has been made that the members of the staff to whom reference is made had in any way been prejudiced on account of their religion. The Department is fully competent to deal with all matters affecting the staff, and the Government see no reason for any independent inquiry, as suggested.

Lord De Freyne's Estate.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Congested Districts Board has purchased the estate of Lord De Freyne in the counties of Roscommon, Galway, and Sligo: and, if so, whether he can state the total purchase money and the number of years purchase for the different classes of tenants, also the particulars of the arrears, current rent, and untenanted land.

---

† See (4) *Debates,* cxli., 1214.

MR. ATKINSON: I am informed that negotiations with a view to the sale of this estate are still in progress between the Congested Districts Board and Lord De Freyne. Until these negotiations have been brought to a conclusion I cannot make any further announcement in the matter.

Law of Evidence in Irish Courts.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the recent decision of the Court of King's Bench in Dublin, to the effect that a person summoned before a Court of petty sessions to show cause why he should not give solvent bail for his future good behaviour, is not competent to give evidence by himself or any one else by way of showing cause; and whether, seeing that in the event of the accused being unable to give solvent security, or refusing for any reason to give bail, the accused may, under the law as it now stands, be sent to gaol for six or twelve months, without being allowed to give any evidence in his defence, and that the Court of King's Bench has also decided that imprisonment inflicted under such circumstances involves no punishment, the Government propose to introduce any legislation for the purpose of remedying this condition of the law.

MR. ATKINSON: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. My attention was called to the matter so long ago as the year 1901, when I introduced a Bill to amend the law on this subject which was more favourable to the accused than the corresponding provision in the English Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1879. It was not possible to carry the Bill that session, but if there be any reasonable probability that it would be regarded as non-controversial I should be happy to reintroduce it forthwith.

Land Act Regulations for Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Sligo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any regulations, instructions, or orders have been issued by the Irish Government in reference to the administration of the provisions of the Land Act of 1903, under which the reinstatement of evicted tenants can be carried out; and, if so, whether he will lay such instructions or orders upon the Table of the House.

MR. ATKINSON: The Government have been in correspondence with the Commissioners with respect to this matter, but it is not proposed to lay the correspondence, which is Departmental and confidential, on the Table of the House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The question is whether any orders or regulations are contained in these letters, and, if so, are not the Government bound by Act of Parliament and by their pledges to this House to lay them on the Table?

MR. ATKINSON: I do not agree with the hon. Member that there is anything in the Act requiring us to lay this correspondence on the Table.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Are there any instructions contained in the correspondence?

MR. ATKINSON: No regulations have been made, but instructions and orders are contained in the correspondence, which is confidential and cannot be laid.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman see how impossible it is for us to discuss the administration of the Land Act if we do not know what instructions and orders have been issued.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And in debates in this House it was stated that the action of the Commissioners would be open to our criticism. How can we criticise them?

O'Brien Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain the cause of delay in the matter of the sale of the O'Brien Estate at Cornakelly and Corglass, county Longford; whether he is aware that terms of purchase were agreed on by the tenants' and landlord's representatives in Longford in October last, and that when in January last a tenant named Francis M'Cabe tried to have a fair rent fixed by Judge Curran the case was struck out on the ground that the estate had been sold; and can he state when this matter is likely to be closed.

Mr. ATKINSON: This estate is administered in the Land Judge's Court. The solicitor having carriage of the sale states that considerable difficulty, inherent to the nature of the property, has been experienced in completing the arrangements for sale. The matter came before the Land Judge on Thursday last, and he expressed himself satisfied that the solicitor is in no way to blame for the delay. I have called for a report in reference to the case of the tenant Francis M'Cabe, but I have not yet received it. I will communicate with the hon. Member as soon as I am in a position to do so.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: When may we expect the matter to be completed?

Mr. ATKINSON: I cannot say.

The Post Office and the Irish Language.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the authorities in the General Post Office in Dublin, having first accepted a number of parcels from the Gaelic League on the evening of March 1st, sent an intimation to the secretary of the league that the Post Office could not accept the parcels as they were addressed in Irish; and will he state whether this action on the part of the authorities was in consequence of special instructions from himself, or was it taken without his knowledge.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I beg also to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that numbers of parcels posted by the Gaelic League in Dublin containing material connected with the annual Irish Language Collection about to be held were returned by the Post Office authorities because they were addressed in Irish, and that in consequence the business of the Gaelic League has been impeded; and whether, seeing that an average of about 4,000 letters a week addressed in Irish are posted in Dublin and regularly delivered, will he give directions that the parcels in question be despatched in due course.

Lord STANLEY: A large number of parcels posted by the Gaelic League in Dublin, and addressed in Irish, were recently returned to the league offices for a translation of the addresses to be added in English. The course followed was in accordance with the official regulation which is published in the Post Office Guide in the following terms:—"The address of a parcel must be clearly written in English in characters in ordinary use in the United Kingdom. A parcel bearing an address otherwise written will not be accepted unless a translation of the address can be added." It is true that a large number of letters addressed in Irish are posted in Dublin, and it has been the practice, as far as possible, to add a translation of the address in English. But in view of the inconvenience, delay, and expense which is occasioned by this practice, I have grave doubt whether its continuance is justified, and the question is being further considered.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Is it not the fact that an average of 4,000 letters a week are delivered in the ordinary course through the Post Office, addressed in Irish? I received a letter myself, posted in Colorado, the name and address on the envelope being in Irish.

Lord STANLEY: Yes, I believe the hon. Gentleman is correct. If I may say so, I have a great deal of sympathy with the objects of the Gaelic League in certain districts in Ireland, and I shall be very glad in those districts were Gaelic is used, as far as possible, to co-operate with them, but I hope they will not carry it to the extreme carried by the hon. Member of addressing me in Gaelic.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: That must have been done by my hon. friend. I would ask the noble Lord whether he would not endeavour to have letters and parcels addressed in Irish delivered not only in Irish-speaking districts, but wherever they are sent to. Are not letters addressed in Welsh delivered?

Lord STANLEY: I am making inquiries in regard to Welsh. I believe there are certain districts where letters in Welsh are delivered, but that it is not done in the larger centres. It is usual for the address to be put in English as well as Welsh.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to give notice that, on the earliest possible opportunity, I shall call attention to this matter and to the action of the Post Office in endeavouring to thwart the efforts of the Gaelic League.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is any difficulty whatever made by the Post Office in delivering letters here addressed in the German language and written in German characters?

Lord STANLEY: I will make inquiries.

Arklow Postmastership.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the reason which induced him to transfer a clerk in the Blackpool Post Office to the charge of a post office in Ireland; and whether, as in these cases the rule was to advance local officials of proved service and ability, he will state on what grounds this rule is being now abrogated.

Lord STANLEY: No clerk has been transferred from Blackpool to the charge of an office in Ireland; but if the hon. Member refers to the Postmaster of Arklow, who was an officer in the Hartlepool Office, I may say that I considered him the most suitable of the candidates who applied for the appointment. There is no such rule as that to which the hon. Member refers.

The Aliens Bill.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Aliens Bill will be introduced.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I am not able to fix a date at present, but I hope it will not be long delayed?

An HON. MEMBER: Will it be before Easter?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope so.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, before the Cabinet first considered Sir Antony MacDonnell's action in aiding Lord Dunraven to draft the programme of the Reform Association and decided to censure him, Sir Antony MacDonnell was invited to submit any explanation of his action to the Government; whether such explanation was before the Cabinet in writing; and, if not, how it was communicated to the Cabinet.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, after he had been censured by the Cabinet, Sir Antony MacDonnell laid before the Government any explanation in defence of his action; whether such explanation was in writing; and was Sir Antony MacDonnell's defence considered by the Cabinet before they authorised the publication of the censure passed on Sir Antony MacDonnell in the Answer of the Chief Secretary on February 16th† last.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: With regard to these Questions, I have to say I do not think anything can be added with advantage to the Answer which was given a week ago by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: In view of the fact that Sir Antony MacDonnell has been publicly censured, does the right hon. Gentleman not think it would be to the advantage of the public, and common justice to the gentleman concerned, that his explanation in defence of his conduct should also be made public?

Mr A. J. BALFOUR: I believe the case is fully before the House and the country, and I do not think anything can be added.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Sir Antony Macdonnell's defence is not.

Scottish Congested Districts Board.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, having regard to the fact that, under the Congested Districts (Scotland) Amendment Bill, recently introduced by the Secretary for Scotland, it is proposed to allocate a portion of the limited funds of the Board for work outside the present powers of the Board, will he consider the practicability of placing further funds at the disposal of the Board.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I can make no definite statement. No doubt more funds are desirable and could be usefully employed.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 324.

MR. WEIR: Do not allow the defeat in Buteshire to prejudicially affect your decision.

Turkish Debt Decree.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury were His Majesty's Government consulted in respect of, and did they agree to, the Supplementary Decree of September 1st, 1903, relative to the Turkish Debt; why has no correspondence and no copy of the Decree in question yet been laid upon the Table of the House; and, in view of the fact that on April 23rd, 1903, His Majesty's Government had withdrawn their countenance from the Bagdad railway scheme, and had declined to give the assurances required for that scheme as to the appropriation of a part of the Turkish Customs revenue in aid of the contemplated guarantee, can he explain whether any change of policy has since been adopted by His Majesty's Government; and whether the extra payment out of Customs receipts provided for by the Decree of September, 1903, will be available in aid of a Bagdad railway guarantee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: 1. The Supplementary Decree of September 1st, 1903, was the result of negotiations between the Porte and the representatives of the bond-holders on the Council of the Ottoman Public Debt. His Majesty's Government were not parties to these negotiations, but the Decree was subsequently communicated to them by the Turkish Government and by the British Council of Foreign Bond-holders, with a request that they would take note of it; 2. The Decree was published in the Stock Exchange Official Intelligence. There is no objection to laying a copy on the Table of the House; 3. There has been no change of policy on the part of His Majesty's Government; 4. The extra revenue now derived by the Turkish Government under the above-mentioned arrangement will form part of the ordinary Customs receipts, and can presumably be applied to such purposes as the Turkish Government may think fit. The case would of course be different in the event of an increase of the Turkish Customs Tariff, which could not take place except with the consent of the Powers and on such conditions as they might think necessary to impose.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Do I understand that the Government was not consulted before the Decree was issued?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should like notice of that Question. My impression is that they may have been informed, but were not officially consulted. If the hon. Gentleman will put down a Question I will inquire.

Lord Selborne's Appointment.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in recommending Lord Selborne to the Crown for the appointment of High Commissioner of South Africa, he had regard to the circumstance of Lord Selborne having filled the office of Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies from 1895 till 1900, the period of the Jameson Raid, and of friction between the Colonial Office and the South African Republic, and to the effects calculated to be produced by such an appointment in South Africa.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The only circumstance which I took into account in recommending Lord Selborne for the office he is about to take up was his fitness for the post.

Lord Selborne's Salary.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, what was the salary of Lord Rosmead when Lord Commissioner of South Africa; what is the salary, with allowances, of Lord Milner while holding that position; what is to be the salary of Lord Selborne as Commissioner of South Africa, and from what fund is it to be drawn.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The salary of Lord Rosmead when High Commissioner was £3,000 a year from Colonial funds, and £1,000 a year from Imperial funds. A salary of £3,000 a year from Imperial funds has been drawn by Lord Milner and will be drawn by Lord Selborne. There will be paid to Lord Selborne from Colonial funds the same sum as was paid to Lord Milner, namely, £8,000.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: £11,000 in all.

Conditions of Lord Selborne's Appointment.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Lord Selborne, First Lord of the Admiralty, has accepted the office of High Commissioner in South Africa on the understanding that the appointment can be cancelled and revoked absolutely by any succeeding Government holding views different from those of His Majesty's present advisers.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The appointment of Lord Selborne in this and in all other respects follows the customary precedent in such cases.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: There is nothing in the appointment which will preclude a Minister giving such advice with regard to the revocation of such an appointment as he may think fit?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not believe it is in the power of any authority short of Parliament itself to put any limits to the advice a Minister may give to the Sovereign.

Ministers of the Crown as Company Directors.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the number of Ministers of the Crown who are public company directors, he will place the gentlemen whom he may recommend to the Crown for the Ministerial offices now vacant under any, and, if so, what conditions with reference to the holding during their tenure of Ministerial office of directorship in public companies.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The only condition that ought to regulate a Minister of the Crown in regard to company directorships is the common-sense one that no Minister of the Crown ought to hold any office which interferes with the proper discharge of his duties as a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: In that case will Lord Cawdor, at the head of a great spending Department, continue to be chairman of the Great Western Railway Company?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course not.

Question on Procedure.

Mr. LOUGH: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the general expressions of opinion in the House, he can see his way to reconsider his decision, and revert to the former practice of permitting Members who have been successful in the ballot ot bring on their Motions before Ministers explain the Estimates on going into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot concur in the statement of fact or the conclusion drawn by the hon. Member in his Question. I do not admit that the general expression of opinion in the House is as indicated. It seems to me that it is really an unbusinesslike plan for the House to discuss a policy or the details of a policy before they know what that policy is.

Mr. LOUGH: But as this is an immemorial ancient privilege of private Members, will not the First Lord leave it to the judgment of the House?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It cannot be a privilege of hon. Members to discuss a thing with which they are imperfectly acquainted.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. A. J. Balfour said hon. Members could better by far discuss the Estimates when they knew the policy of the Government, and therefore the course he proposed was one dictated by sound reason.

The Unemployed.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Bill dealing with the question of the unemployed will be introduced.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think the Bill ought to be long delayed, but I cannot give a specific reply to the Question of the hon. Member opposite.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Has the right hon. Gentleman any statement to make with regard to public business?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: On Tuesday I propose to put down the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates, Class 5, Somaliland, and the remaining Votes in the Army Supplementary Estimates. On Wednesday I shall proceed with the Supplementary Estimates if they are not finished on Tuesday, and on Thursday I shall take the Navy Votes.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked if the Navy Votes could not be put off till next week, as they really had no information before them.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think there is need for any long delay. Hon. Gentlemen inform me that they are already in possession of very full information.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I asked for certain information at Question time to-day, which I considered very material, and was told it would not be ready for a fortnight.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that that information is germane to Vote 8 rather than to the debate on Vote A and Vote 1.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Vote 8 should be discussed with Vote A.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT asked in what order the Estimates would be taken on Wednesday? Would the Army or Civil Service come first.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It depends very much on the progress we make to-morrow. Perhaps the hon. Member will ask at the conclusion of that sitting.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said it was desired to have a general discussion on Somaliland dealing with both the military and the civil administration. Would it not, therefore, be better to put the Army Estimates down first.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the course I suggest would be the most convenient to the House.

RESIGNATION OF THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It is with the deepest regret that I have to inform the House that I have not found myself any longer able to resist the appeals made to me by my right hon. friend the Member for Dover that he might be permitted to resign his office. The ground of his resignation is not ill-health, though I frankly admit that I do not believe that he would be at present able to support all the labours and all the anxieties of a great administrative office. His principal reason is that he is of opinion that the controversy which has recently taken place both within and outside these walls has greatly impaired, if not wholly destroyed, the value of the work which he could do in the office he has so long held. On the merits of that controversy I propose to say nothing, though there are parts of it on which I retain a very strong opinion. But with regard to the effect it has had upon my right hon. friend's usefulness he, and he alone, must be the judge; and, reluctant as I am to yield to his desires, I feel that when they are pressed on such grounds as these it is impossible for me longer to resist them. I ought, perhaps, to add that my right hon. friend is not able to be present to do what is usual on these occasions—to make his own statement in explanation to the House, and I earnestly trust—and I am sure hon. Gentlemen on all sides of the House will agree with me in wishing—he may soon be sufficiently restored to give fully that explanation which I have only imperfectly outlined.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Leifchild Stratten Jones, esquire, for the County of Westmoreland (Northern or Appleby Division).

ADJOURNMENT.—LORD SELBORNE'S APPOINTMENT.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL Member for South Donegal, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the appointment of Lord Selborne to the High Commissionership of South Africa, having regard to the circumstance of his having filled the office of Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies from 1895 till 1900, the period of the Jameson raid, and of friction between the Colonial Office and the South African Republic which led to the Boer War;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen:—

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until the Evening Sitting, this day.

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order for Committee read.

On the order of the day for going into Committee of Supply on the Navy Estimates, Mr. SPEAKER called on Mr. PRETYMAN, who rose amid Opposition cries of "McCrae," in whose name there was a Motion on the Paper.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Mr. Pretyman is in possession of the House.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked leave to submit a point of order and to conclude with a Motion. He said it was in accordance with precedent, and it was also a long-established practice of the House that a private Member who had secured a place by ballot for a Motion on going into Supply should be called on first. The practice had only gained ground in the last few years of giving the Minister precedence, and in order to test the point he was going to submit a Motion—of course, not out of any discourtesy to the Secretary to the Admiralty, but the House, he submitted, ought to have an opportunity of expressing an opinion on this grave alteration of the established practice. In 1881 a Motion of Mr. Gladstone's that Mr. F. H. O'Donnell should no longer be heard was accepted and met with no opposition from the other side of the House or indeed from the Irish Members, some of whom were still Members of the House of Commons; but rather than make that Motion he would submit it in an older form, for which there was precedent:—"That Mr. McCrae be now heard."

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot accept that Motion. No doubt there are instances—if the hon. Member goes back for 200 to 250 years he will find them to be quite common—of a Motion being put exactly in the terms he has put before the House. But it has long been the practice for the Speaker to call upon the Member who had caught his eye and that no dispute is allowed as to who was the person who ought to have caught his eye. That is the rule now. The case referred to in 1881 was not one involving the question which of the two hon. Members should be heard; it was a case where an hon. Member was rising for the purpose of raising a question of extreme delicacy relating to foreign affairs. It was then thought proper by the Prime Minister to move that he be not heard. It was somewhat in the nature of moving the previous Question rather than a selection between two hon. Members. I think it would be an extremely mischievous departure if a now long obsolete practice should be revived, and if whenever the Speaker called on an hon. Member who caught his eye there should be a debate possible on the question that someone else should be heard. I would add, further, that in the present case it would be an extremely irregular Motion, because the hon. Member on the Treasury Bench has risen to move an order of the day. He has a perfect right to move an order of the day, when it is called, and if he chooses to preface the moving of that order by observations it is not out of order that he should do so.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) asked if there was no way in which the opinion of the House could be taken on a change of the almost immemorial practice.

*MR. SPEAKER said there was hardly any question on which it was not possible to obtain the opinion of the House, but the proper method was by notice of Motion.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Would it be equally in accordance with the rules of House on the first night of going into Committee of Supply on the Civil Service Estimates to take away the rights of private Members?

*MR. SPEAKER said that hon. Members had spoken of a long unbroken practice but that particular practice, had not obtained for the last five or six years.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: But whether it is a long unbroken practice or not, is it to be broken in the case of the Civil Service Estimates without the opinion of the House being taken on it.

*MR. SPEAKER: There is no general statement by a Minister on that occasion?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: But there might be.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) asked whether there was any method of ascertaining and declaring to the House that a practice had become obsolete or had fallen into desuetude.

*Mr. SPEAKER: No one knows better than the hon. Member that there are numerous practices of the House which have become obsolete. In this particular case I have called on the hon. Member to move the order of the day which stands in his name, and he is perfectly in order in discussing it.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE was sorry to prolong the incident. Might he put his Motion in the other form? He had thought he was putting it in a less offensive form than that the hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench might be no longer heard. They were not asserting a right to challenge the Speaker's power to call on a Member to address the House. The question was rather as to the method of obtaining the opinion of the House on a complete change in its practice. To avoid interruption of a speech in the course of delivery and to ascertain the opinion of the House, he proposed to put the Motion in the older form, "That Mr. Pretyman be not heard."

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has been called upon by me to move the first order of the day. He is entitled to do so, and it would be quite out of order to interpose with a Motion that he be not allowed to move the order of the day.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Has it not been the practice for many years for a member of the Government to move formally that you do leave the Chair, and then to allow a Member who has been successful in the ballot to move his Motion?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Both practices have prevailed. I have given my opinion, and if I am wrong, I must be corrected in a different way. [Opposition cries of "How?"]

*The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): I desire, in moving that the Speaker do leave the Chair, to make, upon the authority of the Admiralty, a general statement upon the Navy Estimates for the year. It will be admitted that the present moment is one of considerable excitement and feeling in the House, but I venture with very great respect to remind the House that naval administration is not a Party question, that it never has been treated as such, and I sincerely hope that that procedure will be followed in the present instance. I cannot, of course, but be aware of the strong feeling that has to-day found expression as to the expediency of my making a general statement upon this Motion, but I venture to suggest that it really is a matter of convenience that before we enter on detailed discussion of the various points to be raised by hon. Members, and, indeed, before there can be useful criticism of the various points, it is an advantage that a general statement on policy should be made, for policy, after all, must govern the whole Estimates, and in the light of the statement and the discussion following minor points must be considered. In making my statement I have no intention of wearying the House upon points of detail, for I feel that these have been fully stated in the Statement prepared by Lord Selborne, and laid before both Houses; and I believe it is the practice of this House for the discussion of points of detail to be entirely matter for the Opposition of the day; they select the points for discussion, and I desire to submit to the practice and to answer on these points of detail. I do not desire to go over the ground discussed by Lord Selborne, but I do wish to fill up any gaps that may be left in that Statement. I do not desire to stand any longer than is necessary between the House and that eulogy of the Admiralty and the Government which the hon. Member for King's Lynn is always ready to deliver—I observe he is not now in his place, and does not appear to take much interest in the Navy Estimates of the year.

The salient feature which will have struck everybody in the year's Navy Estimates is the large reduction in the figures placed before the House. The reasons for the reductions are stated by Lord Selborne, and I do not propose to enlarge on them, but I will venture to make the general observation that, in making comparisons, we are liable to compare one year with another, whereas it is not this year as compared with last year which is so much in question as whether, in the circumstances, we are wisely or unwisely making our present proposals, and if they cover our requirements. The first consideration, apart from the reduction, which will be in the minds of hon. Members is the new scheme—if it can be called a new scheme—which was laid before the country first in Lord Selborne's Memorandum of December 6th, and further circulated in the Explanatory Statement on the Estimates now before the House. That general scheme has been treated in the Press of this country and apparently in general opinion as if it consisted of three general parts—first, the redistribution of the Fleets; secondly, the elimination of out-of-date ships; and thirdly, the organisation of new bases. These have been treated as three separate parts, but I venture to submit to the House that is not a correct view to take of this great scheme of reform. These three reforms really form one homogeneous, inseparable whole, they cannot in any sense be treated separately, they are interdependent one upon the other. The redistribution of the fleet depends mainly, if not entirely, on mobility; it is mobility, and mobility alone, which admits of concentration; and through this mobility it is possible to avoid the multiplication of naval bases. By increase of mobility we have been enabled to reduce the number of the less up-to-date ships in all parts of the world, and also to reduce smaller and more distant bases. But it will naturally be asked, why and where at this particular moment does mobility come in? I venture to point out to the House that there are two new factors of the greatest importance and of world-wide operation, the advent of armoured cruisers in considerable numbers and the invention and use of wireless telegraphy. Dealing with the scheme as a whole, I say it is based on these two factors of general application, and secondly, there is the application of a local factor of very great importance, that the great and important base of Gibraltar is only now available for the use of the Fleet. With these facts in mind we see the Admiralty is able to concentrate ships in homogeneous squadrons near our own waters, but available through facilities of communication and the now available form of wireless telegraphy, and, taking into consideration the high steaming capacity of these ships, to despatch armoured cruisers to particular places at a few hours notice instead of having ships of vastly inferior power located at longer distances. That is really the whole basis of the scheme.

I do not wish to split hairs or to go into details, but I notice in the criticisms upon one point, and gather from Questions in the House and from Returns asked for, that it is suggested—in fact, it has been so stated in the Press—that the Admiralty in removing these ships from the first line of battle [AN HON. MEMBER: How many?]—the Prime Minister said they numbered 130, but I believe he was under the number; I think the number is something like 160 removed from the first line—that they are removed altogether. I may say here that in removing these ships it does not mean that they are all necessarily obsolete and useless for any purposes of war. Many of these ships, it must be clear to the minds of many having knowledge on the subject, though removed from the first line, belligerents to-day in the Far East would give large sums for and find most useful. The keynote of the scheme is that every ship for which heavy current expenditure is incurred in this country for keeping in commission shall be ready for war. That is the principle. Then there are also other ships entirely obsolete. There is nothing new about that. [AN HON. MEMBER: How many of them?] Really one would think that the policy of the Admiralty on a great question such as this should be decided by considering whether 2½d. had been spent on this ship or that ship last year. I desire to raise the debate to a higher platform—to consider the efficiency of the Navy, and not whether this Government or that Government has spent 2d. too much or too little. As a matter of fact, in the last three years, no less than eighty-four ships have been placed on the scrap heap. The number of ships this year is in excess of the average. But where there is a new policy is this. There is an intermediate class of ships, of which a naval officer rather wittily said, "They are neither sheep nor goats; they are llamas." There has been a llama class created. That is a class of ship which might be extremely useful for subsidiary purposes of war. They might come into action when the first line of the ships of this country, and of a possible enemy of this country, had been exhausted. No money will be expended on them. They will not be available for instant use in war, but will be moored in the immediate neighbourhood of a great shipyard, such as the Clyde; and in the course of three months, in case of war, these ships might be made available and be very useful. In the meantime the money of the country will not be expended upon them. That is the principle. The Admiralty has been attacked for not removing these ships sooner. But to-day I see in *The Times* a letter from a very distinguished naval officer, who attacks the Admiralty for having removed too many ships, and removed them too soon. So, between these two critics, I think the Admiralty has done the right thing, and we have done it at the right time. In discussing the new scheme of redistribution and the question of the nucleus crews, I desire to deal with them on the broad lines of general policy, and to leave questions of detail to be dealt with when we come to the Votes. I venture to suggest that the Returns asked for by hon. Gentlemen opposite are not belated. They will be available when we come to these details, but their effect upon the present discussion of general policy is not important.

The next question is that of designs. It will have been noticed by those who have read the First Lord's Statement that a Committee has been appointed to consider the great and very important question of designs. I would point out that it is sometimes rather hastily concluded that the question of design is one which primarily rests with those great professional designers of whom this country is so justly proud, and that it is the great naval architect and designer who has in his charge the first stage of a design. It is not so. The first stage of a design is that the Navy itself—that those officers who are responsible for naval strategy and naval tactics! should lay down clearly what their requirements are. That is the first stage of a design, and I believe that some of our, I will not use the word "failures"—but we have had perhaps less success in designing in the past because the first stage has not been given sufficient importance. Therefore, the first step in the consideration of this subject of designs by the Committee appointed by Lord Selborne was the formation of a Committee of future and present leaders of the British Navy to discuss our requirements and to lay them down as clearly as possible in a reference to the Committee. That is the proceeding that has been followed, and I believe that the Committee, with the guidance it has received in that form, will be able, without delay, and in a most able and effective manner, to produce for this country designs of the very best form, embodying all that science can yet give us for modern ships of war. In that connection I think it is necessary here to remind the House of the extreme value of the assistance which the Admiralty have received from committee work on naval questions. Every change, every reform, the introduction of a new process or improvement, is preceded by the appointment of a Committee to consider the whole question. Those who are responsible for the administration of the Navy cannot have under their own hats all the information that is necessary to enable them to exercise their judgment on any question which has to be decided. But what is judgment without information? To exercise judgment it is necessary to have the fullest and most expert evidence on the question to be decided. It is impossible to exaggerate the value of the assistance which has been given to the country and the Admiralty by hon. Members on both sides of the House, by the best brains of the Civil Service, by the best brains among those who are connected with naval construction and the use of ships. In addition to the Committee on Designs we have had the Committee on Promotion presided over by Lord Goschen, and the Committee on the Naval Reserve, presided over by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwickshire. We have also the Committee appointed to consider the Organisation of the Dockyards, and the Permanent Manning Committee. There is, of course, also the Board of Admiralty, which is nothing but a Committee, and, for that matter, there is also the Defence Committee. There are many other Committees. I will not weary the House by naming them all, but I desire to take this opportunity of expressing the indebtedness of the Admiralty to all those gentlemen who have come forward and given such invaluable assistance.

There is one point in reference to these Committees that I should like to touch upon. In a very large proportion of the matters which come up for decision the issue which is constantly arising is—"Is this particular thing necessary for war?" There is only one person who can give an answer to that question, and that is the First Sea Lord, that is his particular function. He is the adviser of the First Lord on all questions of policy and preparation for war. I only mention this to show how enormously important it is and how much time is saved by the fact that in a very large number of cases the First Sea Lord is a member of these Committees. That "short-circuits" business, and enables a decision to be given on the spot as to many points which involve reference and discussion. That prompt action can be taken only on the authoritative personal statement of the First Sea Lord on such matters as to whether or not it ministers to the fighting efficiency of the Navy and its instant readiness for war; and, therefore, the presence of the First Sea Lord on these Committees has been invaluable and has accelerated the carrying out of these reforms and changes.

The next thing I would like to say a word or two upon is the question of new construction, and also of rapid construction. It may, perhaps, have been noted in Lord Selborne's Statement that he remarks that we had hopes of greatly accelerating our rate of building. It must be evident to the House that the acceleration of the rate of building is a matter of very great importance to the Navy. It is clear that vessels which have been quickly built can go into the line of battle with much more recent improvements and developments embodied in them, and much better equipped for war than vessels which were laid down earlier and could not have those improvements embodied in them. Secondly, there is the avoidance of alterations in construction, which are expensive. As an alternative to that expensive alteration, ships are sent into the line of battle without those improvements in naval architecture and gunnery. A third great advantage is the better utilisation of capital, because it is perfectly clear that the money which is being spent on a ship obtains no fruition until that ship is in the fighting line. Then there is the better utilisation and greater economy of plant in the dockyards, because, if ships are built more quickly, it is not necessary to lay down as many ships at one time, and, therefore, greater value is obtained from the plant. Another point is that it is a great advantage in considering new designs that we should have as recent experience as possible of the ships last sent into the fighting line. It is desirable, if it were possible, that when a ship has been designed she should be built and examined and tested before another ship is laid down. You would then have the fullest experience of the latest ship before you lay down the next one. That is, perhaps, an ideal, but the nearer we can approach it the greater will be the advantage to the Fleet and to the country. I do not now wish to discuss the question in detail, but I will remind the House that the total of new construction is not necessarily any criterion of the number of ships which are laid down in any particular year. It is possible to put down a small sum for new construction, and lay down a great number of ships towards the end of the financial year and spend little on each. On the other hand, you may lay down a few ships early in the year and spend a considerable amount of money on each. Therefore what is required in considering the question is sufficient information and a wide horizon.

Next, I would say a word on the question of education and training. The education and training of the Navy is a matter which was discussed at very great length in this House on the new scheme, and I do not propose to go over the old ground. I see the suggestion has been made that there should be a naval staff college. I venture to suggest that the sea is the naval staff college of the Navy. The Navy has a very great advantage over the land forces in that a naval officer has daily the actual responsibility for the welfare of his ship and the lives of those in it. He is put to the daily test; his nerve, knowledge, and sea equipment are daily tested, and that being the case, there does not seem to be the same necessity for a staff college for the Navy as there is for the sister service. The training at Osborne has been, and continues to be, an unqualified success. The system of entry has answered extremely well. The principal difficulty in training young officers is the training of midshipmen when they first join. There is the inevitable conflict of the requirements of duty and education, and midshipmen naturally, perhaps, prefer the requirements of duty to those of the schoolmaster. That difficulty has not yet been entirely surmounted, but every possible attention is being given to it.

On the question of gunnery, to which very much attention has been directed in this House, I think it will have been seen with approval that a new departure has been made in the appointment of an Inspector of Target Practice for the whole Fleet, and the first appointment to that post of Admiral Percy Scott, whose name is so well known for his invaluable inventions and the training he has already given to the Fleet in the matter. There is also a very great and continued improvement in the appliances for shooting and training of *personnel* to shoot. In the matter of sights I would remind the House there is no such thing as finality. It is not merely a question of attaching one piece of metal to another, but a question of very great complication. The perfect sight has never been attained, and never will be. All we can do is to attain as near as possible to perfection. The latitude given in practice to the Commander-in-Chief has been very considerably increased, and in that matter there will be changes of very great advantage to the service. There has been a new departure also. Committees are sitting in the Channel and Mediterranean Fleets to consider the question of fire control in action. These Committees have reported, and their scheme of fire control in action, requiring new appliances and regulations, has been adopted. Ships are being fitted with it, and very great advantage will be derived in action from what has been done.

I should wish now to fulfil a pledge given last year—and not fulfilled owing to reasons beyond my control—and give some information to the House in the matter of submarines. The House will understand there is information as to submarines and their use which cannot profitably be given here, but so far as information can be given I desire now to give it. First of all, in regard to the actual character of our submarines I believe it is known to the House that the first departure was the order given to Vickers Maxim to construct five submarines of the Holland model. At the same time a naval officer of great distinction, Captain Bacon, was appointed to have sole charge of the development of the submarine for the time, and he and Messrs. Vickers and Maxim together were associated to supervise the construction of the submarines and to improve the type as opportunity offered. So ably did they deal with this matter that even before the first Holland submarine was launched they had already evolved and laid down what is known as the A type, the first type of submarines. I do not want to go into a great deal of detail, but I would mention that the evolution of the submarine in the hands of Captain Bacon and Vickers Maxim has been this. After the A class there has been a still further development to the B class, and the comparison between the original boats and the B class is as follows:—The original boat was 150 h.p.; the present B class is 850 h.p. The original boat had a surface speed of 7½ knots; the B class has a surface speed of 13 knots and a radius of 500 miles. The displacement has risen from 120 tons to 300, and the below-water speed is 9 knots with a ten hours' endurance. The motive power on the surface is derived from a petrol engine; below water it is electricity. The reason of that is evident, because the petrol motor requires air, which cannot be obtained below water, and electricity requires a great deal of weight. The weight required for storing sufficient electricity for surface motor power would be prohibitive. As to the diving, these boats dive dynamically, and not statically. They always retain a slight margin of buoyancy, and, when they are brought down to their lowest point of buoyancy, they dive by the application of a horizontal rudder. As soon as the vessel gets into motion she overcomes her natural buoyancy by the use of a horizontal rudder; so she can only remain under water while in motion under the application of the rudder. There is very great security in that, because if anything happens to the boat she must automatically rise to the suface. She takes three minutes to dive. There is no real generic difference whatever between a submarine and a submersible boat. It is a question of the margin of buoyancy. The submersible has considerably more margin of buoyancy than the submarine. We have now thirteen of these boats on the Navy list, exclusive of the five original Holland pattern. There are thirteen A and B type, and also ten more in an advanced stage of construction. These boats have been constantly at work during the last two years, subject to manœuvres of very great severity, but on all occasions they have proved themselves very reliable.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Could the hon. Gentleman tell us what it would cost?

*Mr. PRETYMAN: I do not know the exact figure, but I should think about £50,000. The House will not expect, of course, that I should enter into any detail as to our intention with regard to the submarines or their distribution, but I may state generally that amongst those nations who use submarines in war their *rôle* will be supplementary to the surface torpedo craft. They are able through their invisibility to do in the day exactly what surface torpedo craft can do by night. The main attribute of the latter is invisibility. That invisibility the submarines attain by day. They have, of course, a very considerable moral effect upon an enemy; that is certainly one of their attributes. Another advantage of the submarine over her sister, the surface torpedo craft, is that, as she approaches her enemy, or supposed enemy, in daylight, it is possible to make perfectly sure of the character of the ship she is attacking before she launches her torpedo. The House will recognise that one of the greatest possible dangers in war time is that at night a surface destroyer would have the very greatest difficulty in making quite sure of the character of the ship she was approaching in the dark, whereas in the daytime with the submarine that danger would altogether disappear. You may classify a submarine as a daylight torpedo-boat of moderate speed and very considerable radius of action. I would mention one other point. It is not a present condition, but it certainly may be looked upon as a possible condition, that certain areas in war time, by the use of surface torpedo craft by night and submarines by day, may be practically denied to large ships. At present the only answer to that is that the other belligerent should be in a similar position to deny those same waters to its enemy's ships. Therefore the submarine in that particular is the only answer to the submarine. There is one other immediate and very important function of the submarine, and that is the defence of our ports, harbours, and coast. That is the most important point. It is quite clear that the use of the submarine extends the range of the defence far beyond the guns of the forts defending any harbour. These vessels will not only defend the ports, but link up the defences, and the possession of a sufficient number of them would greatly reduce the anxiety of any Admiral entrusted with the defence of our coast.

I do not wish to weary the House with more detail, but I will now refer to the question of new construction. It will be seen that our programme of new construction is not quite so heavy as it has been, but obviously it is not possible for me to state all the considerations which must be in the minds—if I knew them—of the Committee of Defence and the Board of Admiralty in deciding the programme of new construction for the year. I will only say this. This programme of new construction is the result not of considerations of finance or economy in the first instance, but of considerations of efficiency. Having the whole area of the navies of the world to view, the subject, of course, is vast, and with so many ramifications it is scarcely possible to allude to all the considerations which must be in the minds of those who are responsible for it. Viewing the question as a whole, recognising that one year's programme dovetails into another, and including the deferred or abandoned ships of last year's programme, the demands which are put forward for new construction in this House have been arrived at only after consideration of the whole requirements of this country, of the risks which we run, of the interests we have to defend, and of the necessary efficiency, taking all these facts into consideration. But I have no doubt that this discussion will turn chiefly on the ships which have been removed from the Navy as non-effective and inefficient. I was asked questions to-day about two of those ships, the "Clio" and the "Cadmus," which suggested that they were recent ships, but absolutely non-effective. I do not think one of them would be considered by hon. Gentlemen opposite as entirely non-effective, because one of her most recent performances was no less than the deportation of a Prime Minister and a Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I think when that ship is for sale she will probably be bid for by some hon. Gentleman opposite.

I think I have now on broad grounds of policy, so far as I am able, stated the case for the Navy Estimates which are before the House. I have not attempted to cover the whole ground, and I hope it will be considered that any points which I have left out have been so left out either because they were fully dealt with in the Memorandum of Lord Selborne, or because I thought they would be better considered when we come to the actual Votes and can discuss points of detail. I believe that it will not be regarded as unfitting for me—although he is my chief—to say one word in expression of the appreciation of the Board of Admiralty of the services, so far as they have seen them, of our chief, who is departing to South Africa. It is not for me to praise Lord Selborne, but I would venture to say that all those who have served under him, either as colleagues or as heads of departments, know that Lord Selborne possesses that great secret of successful administration, which is to give the fullest confidence to those under him and to leave to each one the fullest responsibility for all that comes within his province. While we knew that if we wanted a decision we could get it from him, it was yet within our competence to give our own decision so far as work was delegated to us, and I believe that that is the only manner in which a great Department can be successfully administered.

I will only say, in conclusion, that I wish it had been possible for me in making this statement to convey to the House the spirit which has animated the Navy and the Civil Service as represented at the Admiralty in carrying on the naval affairs of the year and in the initiation of these great schemes of reform which have been laid before the House. I believe that it was the First Sea Lord who, in his speech at the Guildhall, said the Board of Admiralty was united, progressive, and determined. I believe that that is true of the whole Board, and also of the heads of departments. But it is not for me to commend credit for the present Board of Admiralty. What I would press upon the House is that it is not so much the action of the present Board, or in any sense only the action of the present Board, that has made these changes possible; the one thing that has made them possible, and a thing which lies greatly within the province of this House, is continuity of policy. The foundation stone of this Fleet which we have to-day was laid when the Naval Defence Act of 1889 was brought in by my noble friend the Member for Ealing, and from that day until now, under successive First Lords of the Admiralty, and no less, perhaps, under successive Chancellors of the Exchequer, on whom the burden has been extremely heavy, that policy has been steadily prosecuted. It is only by continuity of policy, independent of Party, and with the support of Parties on both sides of the House, that a Navy such as we see to-day commanding the seas can be maintained, and I trust that nothing which I have said or which I ever will say, as long as I have the honour to represent the Admiralty in this House, will in any sense introduce a Party spirit into these discussions. I trust also that, whatever may happen in the future, that continuity of policy will still be maintained, and, if so, I have no doubt that, whichever Party is in power, the Navy will continue to grow and become still stronger.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) thought it would be hardly right or in accordance with the sense of the House that they should proceed to discuss now the Statement of the First Lord, or attempt to deal with the Estimates to which it formed an introduction. He only wished to repeat the protest he had made on two previous occasions against the extreme and undue haste with which these great Estimates had been pushed forward. There were new questions of exceptional and enormous importance, and the Prime Minister had told them that the first essential for a private Member was that he should discuss such matters with full information. They had not got full information, and until they had it it would not be proper for the Government to force discussion. There were four material things they wanted to know before they could deal with the Estimates as a whole. The first was the full details of the list of ships discarded from the Fleet, the discarding of which, according to the Prime Minister, had, through one courageous stroke of the pen, doubled the efficiency of the Navy. Surely they ought to know what these ships were, their age, cost, and all other particulars. The second thing was: How many protected and unprotected cruisers, which had been declared by the First Lord to be in danger from our enemy's armoured cruisers, were retained on the effective list? They were also entitled to know the particulars of that great Order in Council which redistributed the business of the Admiralty; the Orders in Council were usually sent to the library, and this, the most important of all, was not there.

*Mr. PRETYMAN: The Return will be issued to-morrow. There is no concealment whatever.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was only stating the fact, and he submitted that these documents ought to be in their hands before they proceeded with the further consideration of the Estimates. The fourth point was: What was the total naval expenditure contemplated in the year about to begin? They ought to know not merely the amount of the Estimates, but the amount of loans for naval works. These would be reasonable questions at any time, but on this occasion they were particularly opportune and necessary, because these were transition Estimates. They were put forward in the name of a First Lord who would have nothing to do with the execution of them, and it was doubtful whether his successor would have anything to do with it. They were the Estimates of a Government which was not at all likely to have the opportunity of carrying them out, and, that being so, they were bound to watch with special care the great body of Estimates, which might be a burden upon a Liberal Administration and not upon those who presented them.

*Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.), in moving an Amendment expressing satisfaction at the reduction of the Naval Estimates, and regret that the Government had not taken steps to procure still further relief by negotiations with foreign Powers for a general reduction of naval armaments, asked whether the Prime Minister seriously contemplated going through the farce of setting up Committee of Supply to consider Estimates of expenditure on the Navy with which this Government was not likely to have to deal. Much was heard about the armour-proof of our battleships, but they were not more invulnerable than was the present Government to public opinion and criticism. He did not intend to say anything that would irritate or wound the susceptibilities of any foreign Power. Great Britain could be perfectly frank with regard to her policy in naval affairs, as there was no Power whom she wished to attack or against whom she had ulterior designs. Our motto was "Defence, not defiance." However difficult it might be to get foreign nations to believe that that was the consideration which dominated our policy, it was nevertheless the fact. He entirely agreed that the question of the Navy should not be made the battle-ground of Party, and he did not think it had been in the past. As the country grudged no expenditure on the Navy, they expected no slackness with regard to naval efficiency, and the Opposition had perhaps shown more than usual confidence in the Government on naval affairs.

He was somewhat disappointed with the statement made by the Secretary to the Admiralty, for he had made a statement which would have been more properly made in Committee. He had fully anticipated that they would have had from the hon. Member a more complete exposition of the new scheme which had been put before the country. He wished to apply two tests to this proposed scheme of distribution. First of all, the test of efficiency, which, after all, must be the first consideration; and secondly, whether it conduced to economy. In these days of inflated national expenditure any relief from the great burden of national expenditure would be welcome. Looking at this scheme from the efficiency point of view, it was to be recommended in so far as it faced the facts with regard to some of our battleships. He understood that all obsolete vessels not suitable to meet the vessels of other foreign Powers were to be discarded, and they were to be taken out of the first line of defence. That was satisfactory. He wished to know if the total of 160 vessels to be taken out of the first line of defence included the eighty-four which had to go to the the scrap heap.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said this was not a new policy. In the past three years eighty-four ships had been placed upon the scrap heap. This year he anticipated that about 160 ships—he did not pledge himself to that number—would be taken out of the first line of defence. That included all the ships which would be of small value in time of war, but they would be retained if required for subsidiary purposes.

*Mr. McCRAE said it was was quite a new departure to take 160 ships out of the first line of defence. There was no doubt that they would have to make up their mind to have a great change in armaments. He remembered Sir William Harcourt's great Budget speech in which he said that the period of a battleship was as fickle as that of a lady's bonnet. Therefore they had that fact to face. The Prime Minister stated at Glasgow that 130 ships were to be superannuated, and they had now been told that 160 ships were to be taken out of the first line. When they got the official Return he supposed they would know how many ships were to be discarded. The Statement showed that 117 of these discarded ships were to be of the cruiser class. They must realise that the advent of the armoured cruiser had made almost a revolution, because it combined great speed with armament. Having regard to these facts, he thought the recent policy of the Admiralty in building so many of the other class of cruisers was open to criticism. This was an evidence that lavish expenditure was no guarantee of efficiency, and those words should be writ large over the doors and on the walls of our great spending Departments. The Government appeared to have applied to naval necessities in their scheme of distribution the principle of their scheme of Irish devolution. It seemed to him to be a co-ordination of detached posts. They were concentrating the Fleet in home waters, and under the new distribution the south Atlantic squadron would altogether disappear. This squadron, like the six Army Corps scheme, had come to an untimely end within a little more than a year of its birth, and he thought they required some further explanation upon that point. Under the changes proposed the Home Fleet was to become the Channel Fleet, and would consist of twelve battleships with attendant cruisers; the Channel Fleet would become the Atlantic Fleet consisting of eight battleships with attendant cruisers, and this Fleet was to be stationed at Gibraltar. Two cruiser squadrons were to be affiliated to these two Fleets. Then there was to be the Mediterranean Fleet at Malta, consisting of eight battleships, with attendant cruisers, and a large cruiser squadron attached, called the third cruiser squadron. In addition they were to have groups of cruisers in European waters, Eastern and Western Squadrons, and another for the Cape of Good Hope, to form the connecting link between the other two. And fifthly, there was the particular service squadron for training. That appeared to be the new distribution. It seemed to him to be sound policy to concentrate the Fleet in home waters and to have as the peace distribution the best strategical distribution suitable for war purposes. He wished to know why the Admiralty had not done all this before, because it seemed such a commonsense proposition? With regard to the nucleus crews, it appeared to him that they were founded very much upon the principle of the new Army scheme under which they were to have battalions at half strength. Having regard to the strategical disposition and the development of foreign navies, this scheme seemed to him to be based upon sound policy. He thought a revision of the old disposition ought to have been made before now. Admitting that the policy of the Admiralty was sound, surely some such advance ought to have been made before the present time. There never was a Government that had such an opportunity of carrying out with continuity the policy which the hon. Member desiderated. They had now every opportunity of giving full scope to that view.

He wished to ask how far this new scheme was conducive to economy? What was the cost of the old scheme? They had the Spencer programme and the programme laid down by Lord Goschen, and considerable expenditure had been incurred upon both of them. The expenditure upon the Navy the year before the war, in the year 1899, was £24,000,000 exclusive of £1,250,000 borrowed on loan. The following year £2,000,000 extra was spent upon a supplementary construction Vote because of a scare that Russia was going to spend £9,000,000 in addition to her ordinary naval expenditure. The following year our policy was dictated by war conditions. He wished to know, was the reduction they were promised this year of £3,500,000 entirely due to the new scheme of distribution? The Navy Estimates before the war were £23,800,000, but the reduced Navy Estimates for the coming year were £33,389,000, which showed an increase of £9,500,000. He had analysed that increase, and he found, roughly, it comprised £2,200,000 wages and victualling expenses, £4,500,000 shipbuilding, and £1,250,000 on works. They had also to take into consideration the fact that the Estimates last year bore a charge of £1,000,000 for the Chilian warships, and therefore the saving would be £2,500,000 if the whole of it were due to this scheme of distribution. In 1901 there was an increase of £4,250,000, and in 1904 an increase of £4,750,000, which, roughly speaking, accounted for the £9,000,000. The country never grudged expenditure upon the Navy, but he thought they wer entitled to some relief from the heavy expenditure necessitated when war was going on.

This scheme of distribution must be judged by the scale of expenditure of other Powers, having regard to the balance of power. Our late policy was to have a two-Power standard. It had been recently said that that should only apply to battleships. Next we had a three-Power standard, and the expenditure last year exceeded, by £6,000,000, the combined expenditure of Russia, Germany, and France. He admitted that we must keep pace with the increases of other nations to a certain extent, but we ought not to keep pace with any threatened increase of their expenditure, which was a very different thing, and which, as had often been shown, other nations had not carried out. If it had been our duty to take the opportunity of these increases to increase our expenditure on the Navy, he thought this new scheme afforded an opportunity for considering whether we could not reasonably reduce our naval expenditure. France had been perfectly straight in this matter, and hitherto she had shown a sincere desire for economy. The French Foreign Minister had stated that France had no need to speak as to a reduction of international armaments, because they had gone on the principle of reduced expenditure. Recent or threatened expenditure by Germany had, however, evidently made it apparent to the French people that they must compete with Germany. This was an opportunity for Britain to initiate a policy of reduced armaments. When Lord Goschen was First Lord of the Admiralty he took a considerable step in advance by making the statement on behalf of the Government that if the other great Naval Powers should be prepared to diminish their programme of shipbuilding we should be prepared to meet such a mode of procedure by modifying ours. That promise was homologated by the late Secretary to the Admiralty, now the Secretary of State for War, who repeated the pledge and stated that the Government was prepared to consider any proposition of any foreign Government. It was rather an ironical commentary on this that, during the last six years, including loan expenditure, we had ncreased the expenditure on our Navy by £16,000,000. That was a policy not likely to impress foreign Powers as to our own anxiety for a decrease of armaments. He thought it was our duty to take the first step. He regarded the present scheme of the Government as a step in that direction.

He would like to ask whether the Government had made any attempt at negotiation with the other Powers before proposing this reduced expenditure on the Navy. Had they, in fact, tried to follow the example of Mr. Cobden when he went to France to negotiate a French treaty? It was stated that this country intended in any case to revise the duties, and Mr. Cobden made that the basis of the argument for the treaty. Secondly, he would ask whether after deciding on this scheme the Government made any representation to other Powers. We had now a good understanding with France, and it ought to be our endeavour to have a good understanding with Germany. The German Premier said the other day that their fleet was only meant for defensive purposes, and to protect their interests abroad. Unfortunately an ill-advised speech by the Civil Lord had not made a friendly agreement any more easy of accomplishment. He would ask also whether this new distribution would preserve us from those war scares which had given so much impetus to our expenditure on the Navy. In another place there was a noble Lord who seemed to be alarmed that some foreign Power would take week-end tickets at a single fare and make a Saturday to Monday invasion of this country. After that there was an appeal from the late First Lord of the Admiralty that the Press should be very careful with regard to the information they gave. They all quite admitted that the course taken by Lord Lansdowne on the Dogger Bank incident was wise and courageous. On both sides of politics they approved of that policy, but why did not the Government at that time make some protest against what the Press of this country was saying against foreign countries? Even a hint in certain quarters would have been sufficient. He had endeavoured briefly to illustrate what he considered to be the soundness of the policy of distribution and of the concentration of the Fleet in home waters; secondly, he had tried to show that the reductions which were promised were not entirely due to the new policy, and that we ought in all fairness to bring back our expenditure on naval matters to the prewar period. He hoped the House would have from the Government a full statement of their views with regard to the possibility of negotiating with foreign Powers. What steps had the Government taken to carry out the views which had been expressed in the House? There was no doubt that a concordat of the Powers would lead to a great reduction in naval armaments. Surely the resources of diplomacy were not exhausted, and he would impress upon the Government the desirability of doing something to further a general reduction of naval expenditure. It was in that direction, more than in the advocacy of an inflated Imperialism which this Government had made to stink in the nostrils of every sane-minded man, that we should conduce to the maintenance of the greatness of our nation. That would be a long step in the direction of international peace. He begged to move.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.), in seconding the Amendment, said he had last year the opportunity of bringing forward a substantially similar proposal on this subject. He wished to re-echo the remarks of the hon. Gentleman opposite that questions in relation to the Navy should be treated as non-Party questions. He himself had always endeavoured to do so, and it was of extreme importance that the rule should be carried out. There were reasons, as his hon. friend had pointed out, why the new scheme should be further debated, and why further information should be obtained upon it. He re-echoed the satisfaction expressed by the Amendment that certain reductions had been made in the Estimates this year. The hon. Member for King's Lynn had asked very pertinently why those reductions had not been made before, and that point had been emphasised by the hon. Member for East Edinburgh. He did think that the House was entitled to some explanation, having regard to the conditions which prevailed now and had prevailed for a number of years in naval matters, why those responsible for naval policy had not earlier proposed the alterations which were now embodied in the new scheme. The substantial reduction proposed in the Estimates now before Parliament had a very practical bearing on the second proposition in the Amendment—namely, that the time had arrived when it was desirable that the Government of this country should take the initiative in approaching other Governments with the view to coming to some understanding for a general reduction of naval armaments. He had always considered the Navy as of prime importance in the defence of this country. He did not think it was sufficiently realised that the Navy provided one of the most valuable training grounds for the development of the best characteristics of our race. He could not help thinking that Parliament and the nation did not sufficiently realise the debt of gratitude which we owed to those who not only administered our Navy, but who were responsible for the equipping and manning of our ships. How did we stand to-day with respect to the strength of our Navy as compared with those of the other great Powers of Europe? Could we afford to take the initiative in asking the other great Powers to come to an understanding as to the reduction of our naval armaments. It was abundantly clear that we had maintained more than a two-Power standard, and that we could, without any uneasiness whatever as to the possibility of our motives being misinterpreted, approach the other European Powers in the direction suggested in the Amendment. It was important to remember, when discussing the desirability at the present time of our taking this step, that we last year spent considerably more on our Navy than the total expenditure of the navies of France, Germany, and Russia together.

Another aspect of the question which ought not to be forgotten was the relation of this expenditure to the taxation of the country. How did we stand in reference to expenditure? In 1870 we spent on the Navy in this country £9,500,000, which was at the rate of 5s. 10d. per head of the population at that date; in 1880 we spent £10,000,000 or 5s. 9d. per head: in 1890 we spent £15,000,000 or 8s. per head: in 1900 we spent £26,000,000 or 12s. 5d. per head: and this year the expenditure was estimated at £33,389,000, or 16s. 6d. per head. The expenditure on the service of the Navy had therefore gone up by leaps and bounds, and that was ample proof that the possibility should be taken into account of coming to some general arrangement with the other great Powers of Europe which would enable us to materially reduce that expenditure. It might be said that the wealth of the country had increased during the past thirty years. So it had, by 30 per cent., but the expenditure on the Navy had increased by over 300 per cent. The main factors favourable to carrying out the suggestion contained in the Motion on the Paper were the results of the war now going on in the Far East. It would be entirely out of place to make any comment on either side in that great struggle; but facts were facts, and what had occurred in that naval war must have some bearing on the realisation of the suggestion now made. Then, another factor was the gratifying success of the recent International Tribunal, set up under the auspices of the present Government, to settle the North Sea Incident. The result of that arbitration showed that there were possibilities along the road of diplomacy and arbitration in regard to which he had been, up to the present time, somewhat sceptical. It seemed, therefore, that the moment had arrived when such a suggestion could be made advantageously in regard to naval expenditure. His main propositions were:—first, that they were all agreed that an adequate and efficient Navy was a prime necessity of our national life; second, that a reduction could be made in the Naval Estimates without interfering with the maintenance of efficiency; and the presentation of the Estimates this year was clear evidence of the possibility of such reduction being made. In 1899 Mr. Goschen, now Lord Goschen, made an important statement on behalf of the Government upon this subject, viz., that this Government were prepared to modify their programme of ship building if the Governments of the other European Powers were prepared to modify theirs. It seemed that that only pointed to the issue, who was to take the initiative?

Last year the hon. Member in charge of the Estimates, speaking for the Government, said that it would be impossible for this Government to take the initiative; but he trusted that that did not continue to be the inflexible conclusion of His Majesty's Government. The time had come when such a step as was proposed could be advantageously taken and on the grounds of international peace and the practical reduction of the burden of taxation on the people of this country he had great pleasure in seconding the Motion of his hon. friend.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'This House expresses its satisfaction at the reduction of Naval Estimates effected by the proposed scheme of Distribution of the Fleet, but regrets that His Majesty's Government has not taken steps to procure still further relief by negotiations with Foreign Powers for a general reduction of naval armaments'—(*Mr. McCrae*) instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said it did not appear to him that the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman opposite was likely to give rise to much serious debate. However, he did not think it ought to be disposed of without one or two comments from that side of the House. As it stood, he supposed that nobody took much exception to the wording of the Amendment, or would express dissatisfaction if the amount of money spent on the Navy could be reduced. And nobody would be unwilling, if it could be found possible, to see steps taken whereby the naval construction in this and other countries might be diminished. The latter proposal had been discussed frequently in the House but they were not much nearer to its solution. As to the argument that there should be reductions in the Navy, the logical conclusion of it was to do away with navies altogether. As long as naval wars were inevitable, so long was it very problematical that any scheme could be devised which would be satisfactory, for diminishing from time to time naval armaments. He would like to argue that we, in England, seemed to take too much on ourselves when we always talked as if it was against us and us alone that every naval Power in Europe was armed. In the German Parliament, when great dissatisfaction was expressed that the German naval force in the Far East was supposed to be inadequate, the name of England was never once mentioned. He had pointed out on previous occasions that the development of the German Navy was not a new thing, that it was definitely and substantially begun in 1864. No one would deny that if it could be done it might be happy for us and all other nations if a general disarmament could take place, but he regarded that as Utopian. He had listened with regret to the allusion by the mover of the Amendment to a speech made in the country by the hon. Member for Fareham. Everybody was aware that the fuss made over it was a mare's nest, and no good was to be done by reviving it. After all, on previous occasions the strength of the French and other European navies had been discussed in the House, and no one could suppose that when an hon. Member was referring to the redistribution of the Fleet, or the altered circumstances of naval strategy, there was any insinuation or reflection upon another naval Power.

There was one observation of the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment which seemed to him to be of no small importance. It had reference to the influence of the Press. That would be a very important influence at a critical time. He did not want to criticise the Press, or to suggest that they would knowingly or wantonly do anything improper, much less unpatriotic; but one could not help being aware that, owing to the modern demand for information, whether it be authentic or not, the Press were tempted, and indeed were bound to meet that demand. Only a few days ago a considerable amount of alarm was spread through the country by the publication of information concerning the Report of the Commission on the North Sea episode. That information was not true.

*Mr. SPEAKER: This seems to me to be beyond the scope of the Amendment.

*MR. REGINALD LUCAS said he would not pursue the question. There was one definite question, however, which he should like to ask his hon. friend, and that was, where in this scheme did the new naval Volunteers come in. They were a new feature in our naval establishment; and had, of course, been received with a great deal of approbation. But he should like to have a definite statement from his hon. friend as to what value was attached by the Admiralty to this Volunteer element. The whole trend of military debates in the House had been to show that the soldier Volunteer was not worth having. He did not wish to detract from the spirit of patriotism which animated the Volunteers; but it appeared to him to be illogical, if it were admitted that the soldier Volunteer was not worth having, that they should be organising naval Volunteers, who would require training far more specialised and technical than in the case of a soldier. If the soldier Volunteer was not worth having, he submitted that, as an abstract proposition, the naval Volunteer would be of still less importance in the naval system of the country. It should not, however, be supposed that he was speaking in disparagement of the naval Volunteers; but the House ought to have more definite information regarding them.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said he was very much struck by the lack of attendance of Members on an important occasion such as the present. He had regularly attended discussions on the Naval Estimates for the past thirteen years, and was accustomed to sparse attendances when minor Votes were under discussion. But that day they had important Estimates before them, which he thought would attract attention and insure a large attendance. He could not help thinking that this listlessness arose from the fact that Parliament was worn out, and that a new Parliament was required. That spirit appeared to spread to the Secretary to the Admiralty himself; because, although he admired the abilities of the hon. Gentleman, and acknowledged that he possessed them to a marked degree, still he had never heard a more scanty statement. He should have thought that the hon. Gentleman would have given the House more information with reference to the disappearance of 160 ships from the line of battle.

*MR. SPEAKER: The debate at present must be confined to the Amendment before the House.

MR. KEARLEY said he thought the question of the disappearance of these 160 ships was germane to the Amendment.

*MR. SPEAKER: To the Main Question, not to the Amendment.

*MR. LOUGH said, on a point of order, that the Amendment dealt with the question of economy; and economy would be affected by the withdrawal of those ships.

*MR. SPEAKER: The economy referred to is that caused by the scheme of distribution. The Amendment also calls for further economy by negotiating with foreign Powers.

MR. KEARLEY said he was addressing himself to the economy effected by the withdrawal of 160 ships from the line of battle, and also by the distribution.

*MR. SPEAKER: The scheme of distribution is restricted to ships in the Navy, and not to ships taken out.

MR. KEARLEY said that the withdrawal of the ships had become necessary because of the general scheme of distribution.

*MR. SPEAKER: It may be part of the general naval scheme, but it cannot be discussed on this limited Amendment.

MR. KEARLEY said the ships had been withdrawn to a subordinate position, and what he wished to know was where the economy came in, as the ships were not to be destroyed. That affected the question of economy and was also bound up with the question of distribution. Surely there was a great lack of foresight in continuing to spend money on these ships. Take one of the ships——

*MR. SPEAKER: This is not in order.

MR. KEARLEY said he would reserve what he had to say until the general Question was before the House.

MR. MAJENDIE (Portsmouth) said that he gathered that the hon. Member who moved the Amendment expressed satisfaction at the reduction in the Naval Estimates. He also expressed his satisfaction, on the ground that it strengthened the Fleet. The hon. Gentleman went on to say that he hoped negotiations would be opened with other Powers. He should like to ask the hon. Gentleman whether he did not think they ought to manage their own affairs without negotiating with other countries. Why should they seek the approval of other countries in such matters? The hon. Gentleman who seconded the Amendment asked why these proposals were not carried out sooner. The answer was that they were only necessitated by the advent of first-class armoured cruisers and the development of wireless telegraphy. The hon. Gentleman went on to state that the Navy of this country was equal to the navies of France, Germany, and Russia. Strictly speaking, they might put Russia out of the question now, but had it ever struck the hon. Gentleman that it was quite possible that America might be brought in? That was a reason why the strength of the Fleet should be maintained. Mr. Speaker's ruling had precluded his going into the question of the withdrawal of the ships and, therefore, he would content himself with congratulating the Admiralty on their pluck in reducing the Navy Estimates in the way they had.

*MR. LOUGH said the hon. Member who had just spoken seemed to labour under some misapprehension. Those who sat on the Opposition side and who had advocated economy for so many years had not reduced the Navy Estimates. It was the Government who had done so, and it was the Government, therefore, whom the hon. Gentleman ought to reproach for so doing. This was one of the most extraordinary occasions upon which they had discussed the Naval Estimates within his recollection. For no less than eight or nine years it was treason, in the House, to speak of reducing the Navy Estimates. Wherever else economies were made, the Navy Estimates were to go up eternally. An hon. Gentleman, discussing the Estimates last year, had said that so far as the Navy Estimates were concerned they would go up and up until they reached £50,000,000. But that idea had to-night been dissipated; the Estimates had gone down by £3,500,000. He did not, however, think the full explanation had been given for this most startling reduction. The House had been told it had been effected by the new distribution of the Fleet, and that, no doubt, was strictly true; but the most vital feature of the scheme of the new distribution of the Fleet had, it seemed to him, been the casting out of the inefficient ships. The question which, then, arose was what right had the Government to spend huge sums on the maintenance of those ships, which all had to be swept away directly the new scheme was put into force? Why were all these millions spent in recent years? One was reminded that there was only one precedent for such a reduction. In 1860 the Navy Estimates amounted to £14,500,000 and they were gradually reduced to £9,500,000 in ten or twelve years. He confessed that when it came to details he was all at sea, but he maintained that it was not the business of the House to deal with details, but with the general question of expenditure, and that was the question to which he had devoted his time. He had persistently pursued that one policy, and, while imploring the House not to raise the Estimates so rapidly, he had warned them that if they persisted in doing so they would eventually have to reduce them in such a way as would make foreign nations think we were altering our policy. This reduction did not agree with the statement of the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty as to a complete continuance of policy. How could the hon. Member reconcile a complete continuance of policy with a reduction of £3,500,000 in the Estimates? If we only wanted 129,000 men last year why did we raise a number beyond that limit a year ago?

*MR. SPEAKER said that this was not in order upon the Amendment, but rather applied to the general Question.

*Mr. LOUGH explained that he had attempted to confine himself to the reduction of the Estimates, which he thought was mentioned in the Amendment, but he had no desire to make any remarks at one time which would be less convenient than at another. He would therefore reserve what he desired to say.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said he thought it was generally accepted that the distribution scheme, in so far as it had caused a reduction, had not caused that reduction at the expense of efficiency, and as long as that was agreed to and the reduction in itself was approved—of which he had no doubt, there was very little to be said further on the question. As to whether we ought to effect a further reduction by negotiation with foreign Powers, he thought the hon. Member would see that that direct method of reduction was an impossible one. For this country to discuss directly with foreign Powers its Navy Estimates was an impossibility.

*Mr. McCRAE said the Admiralty some time ago invited foreign Powers to make suggestions to us.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that direct negotiations on questions of the Navy and the construction programme were impossible. Of course it was perfectly true that one of the most important factors in deciding the necessary strength of the Navy—the Vote for construction and any possible economies—was the state of our relations with foreign countries. He thought he could not better answer the hon. Member from that point of view than by referring him to what had been said by M. Hanotaux on this interesting question, which showed what, in the opinion of the French statesman, had been the effect of the excellent relations which happily obtained between France and England on our distribution scheme. M. Hanotaux said—

> "Hardly had our Parliament ratified the Anglo-French arrangement than the English Admiralty issued an order for the general organisation of the English Fleet and the redistribution of British naval forces on the seas of the globe. Nothing to compare with it has ever been seen in history. The planet is covered by a close network, which, crossing the means of communication and completing the occupation of the waters by that of the straits and shores, enables a constant watchfulness to be kept up all over the world, which, by means of the telegraph, can be transformed into an immediate mobilisation."

And then, after a summary of the situation—

> "It follows that at the culminating point she has reached, our neighbouring Power may calmly await the complications that may arise. By the recent measures she has set the seal to her greatness."

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 220; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 24.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes

Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn.J.E(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, MajEvans (T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nd'rry
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, Sir James (StaffordsNW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F (Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Fredrick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John(Kent,Faversh'm
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hn. Fredk. William
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H L. W (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant(Yorks.NR
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S,
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, ReginaldJ(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, WJH(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlington
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, Sir Harry S(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, HonArthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn J.G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirWH.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Doogan, P. C.
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, SirFrancis H(Maidstone
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Grey, Rt. Hon.Sir E. (Berwick)

Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr.CharlesFredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leifchild S. (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hn.John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir CharlesM.(Durham)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Reid, Sir R.Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.JEB.(IsleofWight
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr William M'Arthur.

Question again proposed.

*MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) wished to join in the expressions of regret at the loss of Lord Selborne. He entirely agreed with the Secretary to the Admiralty that Lord Selborne was a man of business, who always gave a prompt and decided judgment on any point submitted to him. During the last four years he had come in contact with the noble Lord a great deal in connection with the business of the Explosives Committee, and a more satisfactory chief to serve under in matters of business it would be hard to find. He trusted that the good traditions of Lord Selborne would be maintained. With regard to the general discussion, the House were at a considerable disadvantage in examining the broad policy set forth in the Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty by reason of the omission therefrom of information as to the ships that were to be removed from the effective list. Possibly that information could not have been given before the Statement came up for consideration, but in its absence it was not easy to form a judgment upon the naval position for the coming year. Undoubtedly there was to be made a great change, which on the face of it appeared to be in the right direction. The House had confidence in the Admiralty with regard to the continuity of policy of which the hon. Gentleman had spoken, and they had confidence in the new blood which had been imported, but it would certainly have been much more satisfactory if they could have spoken with knowledge of what was actually going to be done in the carrying out of the changes of which so much had been heard recently. The redistribution scheme was the key to the whole of those changes under discussion, but that, they were told, depended upon mobility. It was the increase in mobility that was declared to have enabled the redistribution to be made. The Secretary to the Admiralty went on to say that the reason for the changes now made for the first time were the existence of the armoured cruiser and wireless telegraphy. He was not reproaching the Admiralty for not having made this discovery of the practicability of change earlier, because they were all human, and the best ideas did not always come all at once. These reforms, however, appeared to go far beyond the reason given by the Secretary to the Admiralty. The scheme with which Lord Selborne, Sir John Fisher, and the hon. Member opposite were associated seemed to go far beyond the results of armoured cruisers and wireless telegraphy. The real reason was that new mind and energy had been brought into the whole scheme, and the Admiralty had taken up the question with vigour and energy. The meaning of this very remarkable new departure seemed to him to be that the Admiralty had got away from the influence of that old mechanical formula which they had discussed so often of estimating things merely by the quantity of ships. He agreed with the notion of a Power standard, but it should be a standard of quality as well as quantity. They ought not merely to count ships, but also quality, and in estimating the standard he hoped they would not consider only what followed when a foreign nation added one or two cruisers or battleships, because they could not estimate their power in that fashion. He spoke as a member of a Party who believed in absolute free trade, and as their food supplies came mainly from across the sea he agreed that it was necessary that they should preserve the command of the sea. He did not like even to name Mr. Cobden, but Mr. Cobden did associate himself with the necessity of having a powerful Navy in connection with his free-trade policy. Our policy should be to secure the command of the sea and efficiency. They wanted to preserve their unique position on the ocean, because they were in a unique position as an island with an enormous trade, and dependent more than any other nation upon their food supply and raw material from across the ocean. He was as keen as any hon. Member opposite for efficiency, and he approved of substituting quality for quantity.

It was plain that new ideas were getting into the minds of those responsible for the defence of our shores. Last Friday Lord Selborne spoke of invasion as a matter which was engaging the most constant and unremitting attention of the Committee of Defence, and stated that the more the question was examined the more it resulted in the conclusion that everything depended upon the command of the sea. He trusted that their policy not only in naval, but in military matters as well, would turn upon the command of the sea, and therefore they should preserve the greatest mobility that was possible in the Navy. He did not think it was possible to make a useful comparison between our own and other Fleets. They ought to start with the notion that they had to look to quality even more than quantity, and it was no use judging the efficiency of the Navy by mere numbers. The statement which had been published placed it beyond doubt that the Admiralty had come to the conclusion that numbers did not mean efficiency, but that the Navy was rather impaired by having a number of useless ships. One wondered why this idea did not occur a good deal earlier, for then they would have been able to save a good many millions of money. What was the result of this scheme? There was a reduction of £3,500,000, and he could not tell whether that could become more in the future. He was not in favour of rash reductions in a matter involving the safety of a nation so vitally, but he agreed with Lord Selborne and Sir John Fisher in this matter, for he knew that this figure had not been arrived at without the closest and the most careful consideration, and the assurance that they would have the same efficiency in the Navy. They hoped at the same time that the Navy Estimates would be of a less swollen character than in years gone by. The strength of the Navy depended upon moral considerations as well as financial, and it depended largely upon the extent to which the Navy remained a thoroughly popular institution. He believed the Navy was the most popular institution they had, and therefore it was vital that the people should not feel that it constituted any unjustifiable burden on the nation. There had been in the first place a reduction of 2,100 in the *personnel*, but they did not know how that had been effected. It was not enough to inform them that 120 useless ships had been taken off, because they wanted information as to what was to be done with the crews of those ships. Then there was the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, a body in regard to which some of them had considerable hopes, and in respect of which a Bill was on the Paper for that day. He regarded the Volunteer Reserve as a cheap and excellent source for getting together material out of which the *personnel* of the Navy could be recruited.

There was another feature worthy of comment, and it was the postponement of the four armoured cruisers and certain destroyers in last year's programme. He wished there could have been some more eliminations. He looked with some dismay at the number of battleships of the King Edward VII. type, because the Lord Nelson type was more modern, had clearer decks, and heavier armaments. They would all have been pleased if more of last year's construction Vote had been utilised for vessels of the Lord Nelson type. On page 7 of the First Lord's Statement it was stated that the sum devoted to new ships for 1905–6 was a little over £1,250,000, and that the Admiralty had hopes of inaugurating shipbuilding under a system by which the period of construction would be shortened from thirty-six to thirty months. That was a very important departure. Considering the enormous cost of a battleship, there must be a considerable saving of money by reducing the period of construction. How far this policy would be carried out in the future was a matter which the House would do well to watch, because if this plan could be carried out at all, it was a line that should be adhered to, for it would also result in greater efficiency. It was a great mistake to put down a lot of ships at a time, instead of putting down fewer, and spending the money upon rapid construction and finishing off the ships one by one. He thought that was a change for the better. Hon. Members had all, he thought, had a feeling that we had not been getting in the dockyards all that we ought to have been getting for our money. He hoped that this was only the beginning of a policy of reform which would put things on a more satisfactory footing. In regard to submarines he felt that we were in a much more experimental stage than one would gather from the Statement. But how far submarines were to be of the value which many people set upon them could only be proved by experience, and, while the policy of constructing submarines was necessary and could not be held back, he hoped it would be pursued experimentally until we saw what was the best type, and how far the submarine was as good as it promised to be. There was no doubt that it could do well under certain conditions. It was a great departure and would go far to revolutionise many branches of the work of the Fleet. He saw nothing in the statement as to the speed of our destroyers. There was an uneasy feeling that we were sacrificing speed and other considerations. There was a distinction made between two classes of vessels—those used for one purpose, and those used for another purpose. He gathered that there was to be a different speed for these two. That might be the justification for the reduction of the speed to 25 knots. It should be remembered that this class of vessel depended for its value upon speed before almost anything else, provided that there were sea-going qualities. He did not think there was anything that could be put before the attainment of speed which could give our ships pre-eminence over other vessels.

There was to be a decrease of expenditure on guns and materials connected with guns. That, he supposed, was as it should be, but he should like to hear from the Secretary to the Admiralty what the policy of the Admiralty was in regard to the 6-in. gun, which was a very fine gun of its kind. It was a very efficient and serviceable weapon and some people still put it very high indeed. But it should be remembered that quick firing was not everything, and that the weight of the projectile and high velocity were very important. He would like to know what was being done in substituting 7·5 in. for 6 in. guns on the modern cruisers. It seemed to him that we were outgrowing the 6 in. gun owing to the increasing quality of armour plate, and that we would pass from it to 7·5 in., and even to 9·2 in. guns in secondary armament. He wished to know the views of the Admiralty on that subject. He had no doubt they were giving the closest attention to the matter. One of the greatest attractions of the

Lord Nelson type was the power of the secondary armament. He felt considerable difficulty in criticising the First Lord's Statement from the absence of detailed material. He did not think they ever had less material on which to examine the Statement than they had now. He understood that they were to get a fortnight hence a Statement showing the exact character of the ships which were to be removed from the efficient list.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said it would be quite easy to give to-morrow or next day the names of the ships. He hoped by to-morrow to furnish an incomplete preliminary Report.

* Mr. HALDANE said that for the purpose of this discussion the names of the ships, unless hon. Members were provided with the Blue-books and the Naval Annual, would not enable one to come to a judgment. Even then the matter would require a great deal of consideration. He was not blaming the Government for having to give this Statement in a somewhat incomplete condition. His point was that without further information they were unable this year to form the judgment which they were generally able to form at this time on the Naval Statement. He gathered that the policy of the present year would not be before the House until late in the session, and then for the first time would it be in their power to form some kind of adequate judgment on it. In the main the First Lord's Statement was satisfactory. First of all, there was a reduction of £3,500,000 made under the sanction of names of acknowledged weight. He thought the name of the First Sea Lord was enough to inspire confidence in the House and the country. In saying that he did not in the least detract from the thoroughness with which Lord Selborne and the hon. Gentleman opposite had done their work. The change which had been made amounted to a revolution, and because it was so great he did not feel in a position to form a judgment on it. He hailed the advent of new ideas in this, as he always hailed the advent of new ideas in any department of the Government. After all, this departure was the beginning of wisdom and not the end. On his side of the House they were as keen as the hon. Gentleman and his friends to preserve an efficient Navy, and they rejoiced to think that new minds and new ideas had been brought to bear on a topic of the utmost complexity but which was vital to the life of the nation.

*Sir JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said he did not intend to follow the right hon. and learned Gentleman on exactly the same lines. He demurred to the new distribution being called a remarkable new departure, because, after all, it was but another step in the long series of steps in a process of development that had actually been in progress for many years. He admitted that it was a long step, and that there were many points and circumstances connected with it which required close attention which they could not at present give it in the absence of sufficient information. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had laid it down that quantity was not the sole test of value in the Navy. He had never known any real authority who said it was. As to submarines, he entirely agreed with the right hon. and learned Gentleman that we were in the extremely experimental stage. He hoped that we would proceed with extreme caution, because many large questions were concerned. They had not yet sufficient information, and we could not blindly follow other nations in our naval policy. He thought the Admiralty were right to make, to a reasonable extent, experiments for the purpose of arriving at certain conclusions, but he did not think they should go further.

He intended to devote his remarks to the question of the internal arrangements of the Admiralty. He joined with the Secretary to the Admiralty in the expression of appreciation and high admiration of the work done by Lord Selborne since he assumed the seals of office at the Admiralty. Lord Selborne was unquestionably a very bold administrator, and the most remarkable feature and new departure of his administration was that he had been a great educator of public opinion outside the Admiralty and the service. His Memoranda on the great organic changes which had been made, had been perfect masterpieces of light and guidance for the Press. The form in which his proposals had been placed before the public had a great deal to do with the ready acceptation they had received. In the fifty-five months during which Lord Selborne had held office, the whole Navy had really been revolutionised. Before he took office a system of training and common entry was looked upon as an impossibility, although the necessity for change was recognised. Whenever he raised the question of the training of officers and specialisation in the House it was always opposed on the Government Bench. Only in March, 1900, a few months before Lord Selborne came into office, Lord Goschen, as representing the Government, told him somewhat angrily that the policy of common entry and common training up to a certain point and specialisation afterwards could never be carried out. What happened within fifty months afterwards? It was done. That in itself had had an immense and disturbing effect on the naval service. All he wanted to point out was that with these great changes it should be remembered that the Navy required time to settle down. Under the entirely new condition of things he trusted that the Admiralty would go cautiously until the service had had time to work out its own salvation without much interference from the outside or inside.

It should be borne in mind that the constitution and organisation of the Admiralty had been a most complete success, that it had established such confidence in the service as well as outside as being the best instrument for carrying out the national will in regard to obtaining an economic and efficient Navy that the War Office had this year been remodelled on it's pattern. By experience it had been found that the one-man power at the War Office neither produced efficiency nor economy. The House was therefore bound to exercise the most jealous care in watching any symptom of change in the constitution of the Admiralty. It was for that reason that he troubled the House with a few remarks on that part of the Memorandum of the late First Lord which dwelt on the changes in the constitution of the Admiralty. Among the most experienced sea officers there was a feeling of uneasiness and almost alarm that these changes in process would by degrees have the effect of altering the character of the Admiralty. In expressing regret at the departure of Lord Selborne as a great administrator, he thought it would be found that the whole naval service greeted with satisfaction the appointment of a thoroughly capable business man to take his place; and he hoped that Lord Cawdor would give his sea officers, who were in touch with the service, every opportunity of conference with him and of telling him their views; for it was of the utmost importance that the volume of opinion of the most experienced officers fresh from the sea should be made clear to the First Lord of the Admiralty. They were told in the Memorandum that an Order in Council had been passed, and in consequence certain changes at the Admiralty were being carried out. He thought the House was entitled to have that Order in Council. He mentioned that for another reason. There was another Order in Council which naval officers knew existed, but most of whom had never seen; and that that Order in Council some time ago really abolished sea service as a qualification for naval officers' advancement. In order to allay the uneasy feeling which prevailed in the Navy he asked that these two Orders in Council should be laid before the House. It might be that the alarm was without reasonable foundation, but it existed, and its effect on the mind of the men in the service was very great at the present moment. Having spoken of the Order in Council, the First Lord's Memorandum led up to a very curious expression. It said that—

> "The final step was taken in the readjustment of the distribution of business."

"A final step"! That was a very grave phrase. But when they read further, all they were told was that the name of the Naval Lords was now to be changed to Sea Lords, and that the First Sea Lord was to be relieved of some minor matters of administration. That was an anti-climax to a "final step." If that was all, it was only a twopence-halfpenny thing. The transfer of some minor duties from the First Sea Lord could not be called a final step, but an ordinary office transaction. Therefore, the words in the Memorandum were rather calculated to enhance than to allay the feeling of unrest and discomfort in the minds of some of the ablest and most distinguished naval officers. The more information that could be given to dispel the idea, if it was false, the better; and he trusted his hon. and gallant friend in his reply would be most careful and explicit as to what were the real changes that had taken place in the Admiralty, or were in contemplation. The disquiet in the minds of many distinguished officers who had spent their lives at sea were so far justified by the fact that it was the view of the whole Press that great changes had taken place. The *Morning Post* was a paper of considerable importance, and was generally pretty accurate In an article referring to the First Lord's Memorandum it declared that—

> "The change means in fact that it has raised the office of the First Sea Lord to a position of greater authority and power than that enjoyed by the Commander-in-Chief at the War Office during the reign of Lord Roberts and Lord Wolseley."

That was a specific statement, and naturally alarming to the most experienced officers in the service. What the House wanted to know was if it had any foundation whatever in fact. He hoped that his hon. and gallant friend would be able to scotch the idea that the authority of the Admiralty was going to be more centralised in the hands of one Sea Lord than it had ever been before. He himself could find nothing in the Memorandum to fully justify the uneasiness that existed, except in one little matter on which he wanted an explanation. A new office had been created, that of Inspector of Target Practice. He could not find under what Vote the salary of that officer was to be charged, unless it were that described in the Navy Estimates as Assistant to the First Sea Lord.

* MR. PRETYMAN : No.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB : Then the First Sea Lord would have a new officer attached to him as assistant at a salary of £900 a year, and also an Inspector of Target Practice. Where, then, was the salary of the latter officer charged? Again, the First Lord's Memorandum said that this Inspector of Target Practice was not to be an Admiralty officer—he was to be in the Admiralty but not of them and to be independent of the Director of Naval Ordnance. That was concentrating in the hands of the First Sea Lord an amount of power and an element of direct supervision which had never been the custom in the Admiralty before. It must be obvious that it was impossible for an officer to be sent by the First Sea Lord to inspect target practice without going much further than looking at the target practice. He must be a man more or less concerned in the training of the gunnery which found its culminating test in target practice. The creation of this new office must have this effect: that the First Sea Lord would be in a very different position from that of any former Sea Lord in having an officer attached to him who was not in the Admiralty, and who was to go about from place to place and from squadron to squadron and see not merely how the target practice was going on but really to supervise the Commander-in-Chief. There was uneasiness in the matter in the service because no First Sea Lord had ever been allowed to exercise, as an individual, any executive authority where an Admiral had his flag flying. That had been the bed rock of the efficiency of the Navy, and had been the great safeguard against centralisation and all the other ills of which the War Office had given so many unfortunate examples. Men who spent their lives at sea dreaded being governed from shore. The present First Sea Lord had less sea service than almost any officer of his standing; and they watched with great fear—it might be an unfounded apprehension, but he thought it his duty to express it for the benefit of the service—any change, however small, which tended in any sense to diminish the authority of the Board of Admiralty in its corporate capacity, and centralise control in the hands of the First Sea Lord, no matter how able he might be. He had limited his remarks entirely to this question, as he knew that the one thing that was disturbing the minds of sea officers was that changes were in progress or in contemplation, small in themselves, but which would have, perhaps, the tendency of putting the First Sea Lord as an individual in a position never occupied by any of his predecessors He repeated the service regarded that with the gravest apprehension.

*MR. KEARLEY said that the hon. and gallant Gentleman did not appear to be fully acquainted with the appointment he criticised. It was a matter of notoriety that this appointment was in the hands of Admiral Scott. It was one of the best points ever mentioned in a Naval Statement. Gunnery in the Navy had made great strides, and the Admiralty were deserving of every credit for it. The appointment had been given to the right man, who was the greatest authority on shooting in the Navy. He was, in fact, the father of modern shooting in our Navy. It was his methods that had brought gunnery to its present position, and he was competent not only to supervise but to give advice. It was true his position was not clearly defined in the First Lord's Statement; but as he read it he thought that Admiral Scott would act under the supervision of the First Sea Lord; and at the same time it would be impossible for him not to be under the control of the Admiralty. He was a distinguished expert, and wherever he went records followed him and his system. Hollingshurst, who was presented to the King at Portsmouth the other day, fired ten rounds in one minute at a small target six feet by eight feet and secured seven hits. That was a marvellous performance; and the result of Admiral Scott's methods of training. Admiral Scott's reports would enable the Admiralty to detect more quickly than at present any lack of attention on the part of commanding officers with reference to shooting; and he would be a direct link between the Admiralty and every ship in the matter of efficient shooting. A matter of supreme importance, in view of recent experience, was night firing, which he was told was as much neglected at the moment as was ordinary day firing five or six years ago. [Mr. PRETYMAN dissented.] The Secretary to the Admiralty shook his head, but he had never heard it mentioned in this House; and, therefore, concluded it was not receiving a great deal of attention. It was a matter, however, which would have to be thoroughly gone into in order that it might be brought to a high state of perfection. Port Arthur showed the necessity for that. In the practice on the China and Mediterranean stations the torpedo in pretty well every case had got the better of the battleship in night attacks. He was glad to read the statement that a reliable night-sight had been found. Then he wished for information as to what was being done in regard to gun-sights. With regard to the ten-inch gun-sights on board the "Centurion" the Government had taken a very optimistic view when criticised with regard to them, but the record of the "Centurion" on the China station, so far as the shooting from these ten-inch guns were concerned, was the worst on the station. It could not be alleged to be the fault of the gunners, because, except so far as these guns were concerned their record was above the average. He was informed that there was only one ship in the Navy where the gun-sights were correct and that was one of the ships that was bought from the Chilian Government last year. All he desired to ask the hon. Gentleman was to give the House what information he could as to what was being done by the Admiralty as to the perfecting of the various guns sights in the Navy.

He hoped the Committee on the Organisation and Administration of the Dockyards would improve the chaotic condition to which recent reforms had reduced them. Changes, no doubt, might be necessary, but the piecemeal and chronic changes which went on prevented the smooth and economic working of the yards. It would be beneficial if the Committee brought up a system that would be thoroughly understood by all, and made applicable to all the yards, and thus prevent chronic and irritating change. There appeared to him to be too many small Fishers in the dockyards. Every admiral-superintendent vied with the other to see what reforms he could introduce of his own creation. He had a great respect for naval men, and admiral-superintendents in particular, but he did not think they knew the best requirements of a great civil factory. The best thing would be to appoint a civilian as permanent head of these great manufacturing departments. At the present moment the general manager was an admiral who was only appointed for three years. He had seen a succession of these gentlemen at Devonport. There was the go-as-you-please admiral-superintendent who let things slide along, and then the very energetic gentleman who thought he had discovered the root and branch of all reform. It was red tape from top to bottom, and instead of the competent men like the chief constructors and chief engineers holding the sway there was really a great gulf between them and the admiral-superintendent. That was one of the directions in which reform ought to move. As to the *personnel*, if the Admiralty wished to get the best out of them they would have to treat the men as they were treated in private yards. They were just as much entitled to be parties to the bargaining with regard to condition of work as were the employees of Messrs. Armstrong, who had a trade council of their own with whom the firm negotiated whenever necessary. The men in the dockyards had access to the Admiralty only by humble petition, and by representations in the House. The former was a most unsatisfactory method, while as to the latter he assured hon. Members it was extremely distasteful to have to voice grievances across the floor of the House. There were other matters he would raise on the Votes themselves; meanwhile he hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would be able to give satisfactory assurance about the sighting of guns.

*MR. DUKE (Plymouth) said that while he did not pretend to have expert knowledge on the technical details of shipbuilding and the sighting of guns, he claimed to possess some knowledge as to the proper mode of dealing with civil employees in dockyards, and he entirely endorsed the remarks of the hon. Member for Devonport with regard to the desirability of a thorough overhauling of dockyard administration. At present there was in operation an archaic system, or want of system, the foundations of which were laid almost as long ago as the establishment of the dockyards themselves, and there had never been any methodical attempt to place the yards on the footing on which they ought to stand as practically the largest factories in the country. They employed tens of thousands of highly skilled workmen, who were not members of a disciplined service, who expected to work under the conditions of civil life, but who now laboured under most anomalous conditions. One half of them had an established position, and looked forward to pensions, while the other half had no established position and could not get pensions, although their deserts might be as great as those of their more fortunate comrades. That was surely a state of affairs with which the Committee of Inquiry ought to deal. Then, too, these men were expected to bear themselves as though they were members of a disciplined service, and any systematic attempt to call attention to grievances in the matter of pay or terms of employment was regarded as a breach of discipline. It was most distasteful to have to use Parliamentary pressure in connection with such matters, but under existing conditions there was no other method of exercising upon the Admiralty anything like the influence which the workman outside could bring to bear upon his employer. The present system aggravated the difficulty. The Department was supreme, the admiral-superintendent having just the kind of control that one would expect to be devolved upon a gentleman in a temporary position who was not expected to exert himself very actively for the control or for the betterment of the service. If one of the results of the present tendency to reform in Whitehall should be that the admiral-superintendent, whether he was a naval or a business man, had a real interest in the betterment of the dockyard, some real control, and something like a permanent position, that would be a very great improvement. He did not know whether the hon. Member for Devonport was right in saying there should not be a naval man at the head of the dockyard. Personally, he thought the head should be a naval as well as a business man, and he did not think it was impossible to find such men in the Navy. If the hon. Member were cross-examined as to the present admiral-superintendent at Devonport, he would have to admit that he was a man who combined great business qualification, great eagerness in his duties, and large naval experience.

MR. KEARLEY: But he will go at the end of three years.

*Mr DUKE agreed that a business-like arrangement would prevent that. There was another matter he desired to refer to. He hoped when the Admiralty came to propose changes they would not be suddenly sprung upon the populations in the dockyard towns. In the course of the last few months owing to the necessities of the season of the year, the civil populations of the dockyard towns had been kept in a ferment of alarm. There had been constant rumours of proposed wholesale dismissals, which had had a certain substratum of fact, because week by week there had been dismissals in the dockyards. He hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would bear in mind in any contemplated changes that he was dealing with great civil populations in the dockyard towns to whom dockyard employment was the breath of life. If they suddenly launched a scheme of reform which entailed the dismissal of hundreds of men they created a state of things which might be excusable if the changes were really necessary, but in which want of forethought and proper arrangement might inflict great and needless hardships upon the dockyard populations. If the Admiralty were about to propose changes in the dockyard establishments he hoped they would not be sprung suddenly on the workmen, but that any scheme of dismissal would be carried out in such a way that it would not produce unnecessary hardship.

*Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) said his right hon. friend the Member for Haddington appeared to be under the impression that all the Members of the House, including those on the Opposition side, shared the responsibility of this large naval expenditure. He denied this, for in his opinion the responsibility rested with the present Government and with them alone. The example cited by his right hon. friend did not seem to be a very happy one, for he alluded to the vessels of the King Edward VII. type, and pointed out that a mistake had been made in the construction of eight vessels of that type costing £1,250,000 each. Although the Government had spent this huge sum of money upon these ships they acknowledged that that was not the best type of vessel, that they had since adopted a better type, and that Continental Powers were building a type of battleship against which the King Edward VII. type could not stand. He wished to remind the House that there were some hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House who took exception to this class of battleship last year, and who urged that it would only be common prudence to wait, and postpone the laying down of the last three of these eight ships until they had further knowledge of the vessels of the Lord Nelson type. The Ministers responsible for the administration of the Admiralty should not be allowed to shelter themselves behind the authority and the views of any official connected with the Department, however eminent he might be, and the fact that this official had recommended a certain policy was no reason why the House should be expected to accept it without question.

Mr. HALDANE said he did not say that the Admiralty should rely upon the opinion of any individual, however distinguished. What he did say was that they were in want of fresh ideas, and they were as much in want of fresh ideas on naval matters on the Opposition side as they were on the other side of the House.

*Mr. BUCHANAN contended that the Government were responsible for the policy and the figures contained in those Estimates, and they had no right to fall back upon the authority of any permanent Civil servant, either military or naval. He had listened carefully to the speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty, but he had given them very little information as to the policy of the Admiralty beyond an interesting discourse upon the value of Committees. The hon. Member was expected to say something about the facts and figures of the Navy Estimates themselves, but from the beginning to the end of his speech pounds, shillings, and pence were not mentioned. The Estimates were of great importance from the financial as well as from the naval point of view. No reference had been made to the alteration of the policy of the Admiralty indicated by the figures which had been placed before them.

The principal feature was that they had a decrease of £3,500,000. That was the first decrease they had had for the past ten or twenty years. Surely that was a very important event in their financial and naval history, and they had a right to expect more details as to how this had arisen, what it foretold, whether it marked a substantial alteration of policy, and whether it was a real decrease or not. They had not received any information upon those points. They had been told that this decrease was not due to economy, but to efficiency. He was rather tired of this cry about efficiency. There was nothing new under the sun, and there was nothing new even in the arguments used in the House of Commons. He had been reading a speech made by Sir Robert Peel in which he was found fault with for his want of economy, and he was told that he should look more at efficiency and not economy. Sir Robert Peel's reply was that "Efficiency is the first, second, and the last object of any administration, but economy is the substantial ingredient in any efficient system of administration." They had been told that their ships were going to be built with greater speed, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddington had received that announcement as a step in advance. They had a right to expect the hon. Gentleman to tell them how that was going to be done. He observed from the Estimates that while there was a large decrease in the item for construction work under contract, there was an increase of £500,000 for new construction in the dockyards. Had that anything to do with the question of the speedy execution of the work? He did not think that in the past construction in the dockyards had been much more speedy than in private yards. According to the Estimates there was to be a large diminution during the present year in the amount expended on repairs, and it appeared from Lord Selborne's Memorandum that there was to be an alteration in the policy dealing with repairs. In future they were to be done entirely in the dockyards, as he read the Statement. It was only three years ago that they were told by the First Lord of the Admiralty that they were inaugurating a new policy with regard to repairs, and that these would be partly done by private yards.

*MR. PRETYMAN said there was a misapprehension with regard to that. It was only to meet special needs and to make up arrears.

*MR. BUCHANAN said he accepted the explanation of the hon. Gentleman. The question was discussed at the time whether that would be an economical policy, and many hon. Members contended that it would turn out to be an expensive one. That contention was borne out by Lord Selborne, who now said that the repairs could be more economically done in the Royal Dockyards than in private yards. The House had a right to ask an explanation of the future policy of the Government in that matter. Another feature of the programme was that two new forms of destroyers were to be built—five ocean destroyers and twelve coastal destroyers, and also one destroyer of a new type. It was quite possible that here the Admiralty might make the same financial mistake as was made in the case of scouts. There were still eight scouts on the Estimates this year. From the accounts in the newspapers regarding the trials the scouts could not be regarded as an unmixed success. It was urged at the time the proposal to build scouts was brought forward that it would be unwise to order eight of them right away. Costly experiments should at first be made on a limited scale. It was possible that in regard to the new destroyers there had also been a want of thinking out the subject on the part of the Admiralty. Another important point on which the hon. Gentleman had said nothing was in regard to naval bases abroad. The charges for works at Halifax, Bermuda, Jamaica, and other places which were formerly borne on the Estimates were not in the Estimates for the present year. What was the policy of the Government with regard to naval affairs in the West Indies and Canada? That was a matter of considerable importance. We had been spending large sums of money on these bases.

*Mr. PRETYMAN : Bermuda is not given up.

*Mr. BUCHANAN said he should like to know what was happening at Bermuda. They were told that the garrison there was to be diminished by one-half. Certain works had been undertaken at Bermuda for which there was now no charge in the Estimates. They could only discuss in Committee of Supply items which were in the Estimates and not those which had been withdrawn from them, and now was the opportunity to ask what the policy was with regard to Halifax, Bermuda, and Jamaica. The hon. Gentleman had not referred in his speech to the largest dockyard extensions which the Government had in hand at the present moment, namely, Chatham, and the new works at Rosyth. What was the policy of the Government as to them? Were they to assume that the Chatham extension was going on so slowly that it was hardly worth while to call attention to it? As regards Rosyth, only two years ago the First Lord stated that, after a great deal of consideration and the appointment of a Committee, owing to the congestion of the southern dockyards the Admiralty had come to the conclusion that it was necessary to establish a fourth home port, and that the best place for it was in the Firth of Forth. Land was bought, expenditure was begun, and even a neighbouring town incurred expense in providing for the water supply of the people of the new naval base. A change of policy had come, and no work was now going on at Rosyth at all. They had a right to know what the policy of the Government was in regard to Rosyth, Chatham, Bermuda, and the West Indian Stations. Then the House had never had a word from the hon. Gentleman on one of the most important parts of the Admiralty policy, viz., that relating to the Works Vote, which had gone up to nearly £2,000,000.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that the Works Vote, instead of having been increased had actually been decreased.

*Mr. BUCHANAN said that there was £1,000,000 for annuity and £900,000 for works. If the latter had decreased he was rather suspicious in regard to that decrease. There was no longer any item on the Vote for coaling depôts and coaling facilities. Had this item been put on loan expenditure? In the past they knew that the Admiralty had transferred expenditure from Vote to loan. Another item had disappeared entirely from the Works Vote — the Wei-hai-Wei hospital. That had been begun last year, and a Vote of £35,000 had been made for it. Was the work abandoned altogether, as Wei-hai-Wei had been abandoned as a naval base, or had it been put on loan expenditure for the present or ensuing year?

Then, there was an all important question to which they must have an answer. How could they discuss naval finance when they did not know what was going to be spent? Mr. Goschen and the hon. Gentleman's predecessor used to tell the House what the Estimate was for loan expenditure in the ensuing year. The hon. Gentleman had said the other day that it was impossible to do so until the Bill was introduced; but in 1903 the Bill was not introduced until the last week in July. That was preposterous. They had a right to know before they passed a substantial stage in the Naval Estimates what was the total amount of money which the Government wanted to get out of the pockets of the people for the Navy. Then there was the cutting off of 160 ships from the active list. It was astonishing that they had not had that list put before them, showing the character of each ship. It was three months since the First Lord issued his Memorandum in regard to the matter, and it was weeks since the Prime Minister at Glasgow had taken credit to his Government for having courageously struck off these ships from the active list. When the Government were going to make this great point of reducing the active list, they should have come before the House of Commons and told them what ships they were knocking off, the reason for it, and the amount of money recently spent for repairs on the ships so knocked off. Taking *The Times* list alone, and going through the current year's Estimates alone, he found that £140,000 had been spent for repairs on those vessels which were to be sold or thrown aside as scrap iron. The hon. Gentleman opposite had said that some of the ships were not to be treated as scrap iron; they were neither sheep nor goats, but llamas, some of which were to be sent to the Clyde, and in future wars were to be furbished up so as to be put into the fighting line. He was afraid that if these llamas were laid up long they would soon develop into goats. Moreover, what was to be done with the rest of the protected cruisers? Was this to be the beginning or the end of a policy? The Memorandum said that the protected cruisers of the second class were really useless for war purposes.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

APPOINTMENT OF LORD SELBORNE AS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

Adjournment (under Standing Order No. 10).

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said in respect to the Motion before the House he had perhaps in some small degree a special right to speak, because he knew perfectly well the state of circumstances and the trend of public opinion in South Africa. During the recent debates on South Africa his recollection had been drawn to the words of a gentleman who, unfortunately, was not now a Member of this House, Mr. Leonard Courtenay, who said—

> "Whatever you do, for God's sake do not make of South Africa another Ireland."

It was because he knew the circumstances of the tragedy of Ireland, and the circumstances of the tragedy of South Africa, that he moved this Motion.

He need hardly say that in taking this action he was not animated by personal feelings. He had no unkind feeling towards Lord Selborne, and if he had he should take good care not to use his position as a Member of Parliament to display it. He admitted that it seemed at first sight an ungracious act, an attempt to cast a slur on a man at the commencement of his career in a delicate and difficult office. But he opposed the appointment of Lord Selborne simply on the ground that the post of High Commissioner of South Africa should not have been given to a politician, however wise, and, above all, that it should not have been given to a politician who, rightly or wrongly, through fate or fortune, was largely associated with circumstances which had led to embitterment of feeling, followed by bloodshed in South Africa. Hitherto the great post of High Commissioner had invariably been filled not by politicians, but by executive officers of the Crown, Civil servants who recognised that, whatever their individual political feelings might be, they must carry out the policy of the Government. That was the position of Lord Rosmead, and it was also the position of Lord Milner. But Lord Selborne stepped straight out of the Cabinet into this executive position, and from being the colleague he became the servant of the Colonial Secretary. The High Commissioner of South Africa ought to be a head pacificator. But how could Lord Selborne be that when he had been in the thick of the political fight which had led to the South African War? In the circumstances the very name of Lord Selborne itself was sufficient to evoke the most unpleasant recollections in South Africa.

In bringing this Motion before the House he had discharged his duty to his own conscience, and all he now wished to do was to ask the right hon. Gentleman the first Lord of the Treasury to explain why he considered a Cabinet Minister to be the best person to fill a Civil Service appointment. Knowing how things were he was certain that the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister did not make this appointment without consultation. He could not help thinking that Lord Selborne owed his appointment to his connection with the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. The proper man for the position was not a partisan politician, but a Civil servant of tried administrative capacity.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tidvil) seconded the Resolution, which, he said, had not originated in any personal bias or animus against Lord Selborne. The charge, so far as there was any charge, was against the Government who appointed him. The mover of the Amendment had given some reasons why hon. Members thought the appointment was inadvisable. At a time when the Colonial Office was synonymous with treachery and duplicity so far as South Africa was concerned, the noble Lord now appointed was connected with that Department of the Government. The policy the Colonial Office initiated then had been continued by Lord Milner, and what they wished to know now was whether the Government intended to perpetuate in South Africa a policy which had been fraught with disaster in that country, and which had brought dishonour to us at home. The Government probably expected that Lord Selborne would follow loyally in Lord Milner's footsteps. Why had Lord Milner resigned at this eleventh hour in the Government's career ?—when he had borne the burden and responsibility so long and when, in the course of a few months, the natural order of things would have brought him release by a dissolution. It savoured more of the Boodle politics of America than of our traditions in regard to such appointments. Lord Milner had never been more than a mask behind which the mineowners concealed themselves while carrying out their nefarious designs. It was time that this country should inaugurate an honourable policy of justice and fair play towards its stricken foe.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

Mr. PURVIS (Peterborough) said he thought the House would agree with him that in this very controversial question there was a strong distinction between the speeches of the mover and seconder. The hon. mover expressed the view, and the feeling was worthy of him, that his task was an ungracious task, and that he would be the last to cast a slur upon Lord Selborne at such a time as this. The hon. seconder declared that what was wanted in South Africa was a policy of justice and fair play, and in his argument suggested that Lord Selborne would immediately found a policy which was the antithesis of justice and fair play. That was the inference to be drawn from his argument. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment said that a politician could not be a general pacificator, but when the House considered the appointment of the present Viceroy of India and recalled the notable success of Lord Curzon, a politician, as pacifactor they would not attach too much importance to that statement of the hon. Member for Donegal. As to the argument that we ought to appoint an expert and not a politician—well, that was not the English system. Politicians were put at the head of every Department, and that was the way in which our Constitution had been carried on. If the system had its faults it had also its merits. He would not deal with the somewhat imflammatory remarks of the hon. seconder because he did not believe any one sympathised with them, nor did he believe that the hon. Member himself would approve of them in his calmer moments. Subsequent events justified the Jameson Raid because it was shortly after followed by a declaration of war by the Boer Oligarchy, when it was found that the Boers had transformed the Transvaal into an armed camp. That being so, he suggested the hon. mover and seconder had failed to prove anything to justify occupying the time of the House. In fact, nothing short of a charge of high treason against Lord Selborne would justify this Motion, and such a charge would have to be supported by arguments proving that the noble Lord had levied war against a friendly State. The hon. Gentleman had not given any reason for such a charge as that against Lord Selborne. He was a member of the Government at the time of the Jameson Raid; and the Government took immediate steps to disown it. Therefore, that ought to be accounted for righteousness to Lord Selborne. He hoped that the House would show that the Motion was a perfectly unwarrantable interruption of its business, and a most ungracious and unkind attack on the character of a most estimable public man.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said that the gravamen of the charge lay in the fact that Lord Selborne was going out to South Africa, having been a member of a Government which was carrying out a certain policy in that country. He had not a word to say against the personal character or integrity of Lord Selborne. It was with him entirely a question of policy. And what was the policy that Lord Selborne was going to South Africa to carry out? It was to establish, in the first place, a form of representative government in the Transvaal—a form of government wholly opposed by the Boers and by a very large percentage of the British population other than those controlled by the capitalists. That policy ought not to be brought forward, as it would be brought forward inevitably by Lord Selborne, by a member of His Majesty's Government. Very grave issues turned on this question of representative government. His advices from South Africa were to the effect that the Boers would not take any part in the government if that House decided to place upon them a form of representative government, and that they would much prefer that the form of government should remain as it was than that what General Botha called a "bastard" form should be introduced before responsible government was granted. The Boers were now our fellow-subjects; and it was the duty of Parliament to treat them as such, and not impose on them a policy which was opposed to their wishes. He should vote for the Motion because he thought Lord Selborne's appointment was a most unwise one, taking all the circumstances into consideration.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E): The debate has not proceeded very long, Sir, yet we have heard three quite, I will not say inconsistent, but different versions of the reasons why the House should assent to the adjournment, and thereby indirectly pass a vote of censure upon Lord Selborne.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: No, upon you.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite ready to take it that way—three quite different reasons why the House should pass a vote of censure on the Government, but more strictly on the Prime Minister, who is the person who has to recommend on these occasions. It is very instructive to compare the various versions which are going about among hon. Gentlemen opposite to justify them in going into the lobby against the Government, if that be the intention. The mover of the Motion dwelt chiefly on the past. He seems to consider the fact that Lord Selborne was Under-Secretary in the Colonial Office at the time when there was a considerable and growing difference between us and the South African Republic as a sufficient reason why, five years afterwards, he should not be sent out to carry on the responsible duties of Lord High Commissioner. That was the hon. Gentleman's first reason, and his reason was, if I remember aright, that it should be an administrator, not a politician, who should be selected to fill this great post. I think both those reasons are bad reasons. I am not going to trespass on your ruling, Sir, that the causes of the South African War do not come within this debate, and I presume that the subject of the Raid is equally excluded from it; but whatever view you take of the Raid, and whatever view you take of the causes of the South African War, I absolutely deny that the fact that Lord Selborne was at that time Under-Secretary for the Colonies is a disqualification for the appointment. And while I traverse the particular statement made by the hon. Gentleman with regard to Lord Selborne, with equal strength do I traverse the general proposition which he has ventured to lay down, and which I think will receive no support from those who have studied the policy of this country with regard to these great appointments. I am not going back to the case of Lord Durham. I understand, though, perhaps, the treatment of Lord Durham by his Party is not one of the brightest pages in their annals, they now look back to his administration of Canada as the beginning of a better state of things.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Hear, hear!

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is all very well to say "Hear, hear," in 1905. Lord

Durham was a politician of the politicians, bitter, or, at all events, strenuous, I will not say bitter—even among Party politicians at a time when Party politics ran very high. His Party sent him out to Canada—I will not discuss his treatment when he came back, but, at all events, he was a politician and not what the hon. Gentleman, by a very erroneous antithesis, described as an administrator—to deal with a great colonial difficulty. So much for Canada. How about India? Has it been the practice of successive Governments in this House to send out to India administrators in the hon. Gentleman's sense of the term, or politicians in the hon. Gentleman's sense of the term? Why, everybody knows that, though the rule has not been invariable, the most brilliant examples of great administrative capacity have been drawn from amongst the ranks of politicians, and that it is, perhaps, from among the ranks of politicians that those rulers of India have been drawn who have shed the greatest lustre upon the annals of our rule in that dependency.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Are you going to govern India as you govern South Africa?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not complain of the hon. Gentleman's interruption. It was not discourteous, but it was singularly ludicrous. "Are you going to govern India in the same way that you govern South Africa," asks the hon. Gentleman, though I suppose he meant South Africa in the same way as India? What has that got to do with it? How is it relevant to the discussion? What possible bearing has it upon the contention of the hon. Gentleman that what he calls administrators and not what he calls politicians ought to be sent out as our pro-Consuls in distant regions? The case of India differs in many respects, in profound respects, from the case of Africa, but it does not differ from it in the only point in which the argument is relevant, and if ever there was a country where you might suppose it justifiable to send out what I may, without offence, call a bureaucrat rather than a politician, it is to India and not to South Africa that that justification would apply. And that brings me to another point raised by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Mansfield Division of Nottingham. His reason for objecting to Lord Selborne going out was not drawn from the past, and has no reference to the Jameson Raid or the South African War. His objection was that Lord Selborne was sent out in order to give representative government to the Transvaal, and he objects, in the name of progress and liberty, root and branch, to anything in the nature of representative government.

MR. MARKHAM: I am sure the First Lord of the Treasury has not the slightest wish to misrepresent me. He is perfectly well aware that the most burning question in South Africa is whether the Transvaal shall be granted representative or responsible government, and that the whole of the Boer element of the population ask for responsible government and not a bastard form of representative government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not dispute with the hon. Gentleman that Lord Selborne is sent out, in the first instance at all events, to deal with the question of representative government, and not with the question of responsible government. The view that we entertain, and I do not wish to minimise it in the least, is that representative government is a necessary and inevitable stage on the road to full responsible government. It has been so in all, or, at all events, in the great majority, of our Colonies, and what is a sound policy for colonies almost entirely composed of colonists of English blood is certainly not less necessary in a colony in which racial divisions unfortunately now exist. I therefore admit that the hon. Gentleman is perfectly right in saying that Lord Selborne will be asked by His Majesty's Government to deal with representative government as a stage, and a very long stage, on the road to that final form of responsible government which is the goal to which we look forward in all cases of our self-governing Colonies. Yes, Sir, but is any Gentleman going to get up from that front bench or from those benches opposite and say that a stage which has always been thought necessary in the case of other colonies should in this particular case be omitted from the ordinary evolution of a colony with self-governing rights from the conditions of a Crown colony, as the Transvaal now is, immediately subject to the regulations of this country? I do not mean to deal with the general question, but I would point out to the hon. Gentleman who moved the Motion that whether we are dealing with responsible government or with representative government, it is emphatically desirable that the man who has to deal with it should be a man accustomed to the working of free and representative institutions rather than the man, however able, however experienced in all business affairs, however competent as the head of a Department, who has not been, from the very nature of his training, brought up in the free atmosphere of controversy which is the very life-blood of representative assemblies. Can there be a doubt that at a period like this, when the question of the character of the Transvaal Government and the working of the Transvaal Government is the chief subject that has to be dealt with, the man who can best superintend its inward workings is the man whose life has been spent in dealing with popular forces, in popular assemblies, and in that kind of management of men and debate and business habits which can be acquired, and acquired alone, within the walls of a representative assembly? Sir, I think that I have disposed, at all events to my own satisfaction, of the general contention advanced by the mover of the Motion—namely, that we ought to have gone to an entirely different class of public servant than that to which we have gone, and that we should have chosen a member of the permanent Civil Service rather than one accustomed to the working of a responsible and free government.

I pass from that general part of the argument to a rather unworthy suggestion which, if he will permit me to say so, fell from the lips of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil. He is not a gentleman who, so far as my experience of the House goes, is apt to indulge in vehement invective, or unjustifiable insinuation, but on this particular occasion, moved by I know not what motive, he has given a version of British history in connection with South Africa during the last ten years which I wholly repudiate, which I do not even deal with, and has, in addition, suggested that Lord Milner's retirement has been ingeniously contrived between Lord Milner and His Majesty's Government so that the appointment of Lord Milner's successor might be made by those in office. Now I can assure the hon. Gentleman that that ingenious insinuation has not the smallest foundation. It has been with the utmost difficulty that we have induced Lord Milner to go on during the last few years, and before I endeavoured to persuade—and it did require some persuasion—Lord Selborne to allow his name to be submitted to His Majesty, I made an appeal to Lord Milner, couched in the strongest language I could command, in the most earnest and pressing language, begging him to continue in a post which, though a post of difficulty, he has made a post of honour and glory, and in which I most earnestly desired that he should feel himself able to continue the work which he has so well and admirably begun, and finally to erect the completed building upon the foundations which he has in a fashion so solidly and durably already laid. Well, Sir, I failed. Lord Milner feels it absolutely impossible, for reasons of health, to continue to bear the continuous and unremitting strain which he has borne for eight years, and when an argument like that is used by a man who is so ready to spend himself in the public service as Lord Milner is ready to spend himself, it is an argument to which even the hardest heart cannot feel insensible. In these circumstances, the hon. Gentleman will feel that if the choice of Lord Milner's successor falls to the present occupants of this bench, it is through no fault of ours. We, at all events, have done our best to secure that Lord Milner should continue his distinguished official career in the country where he has made his chief fame, and though his successor will, I am convinced, reap golden opinions in the sphere of activity where he is going, I could yet have wished on all grounds

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

that it had fallen to Lord Milner to complete the work which he has begun.

Now, Sir, I would ask, and really this is all I need ask, is the man appointed a good man for the place? I have shown, or endeavoured to show, that there is no objection to him on the score of general theory or on the score of the practice of this country in regard to its great dependencies. I have further shown that there is no foundation for the insinuation made by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil. I have now to ask last of all the really vital question, is the appointment intrinsically for the public good? I do not particularly like the task of praising a near friend and old colleague in this House, and yet, after all, Lord Selborne was long a Member of this House; he is personally known to the great majority of those whom I am addressing; he has filled with distinguished success one of the great Departments of the State. [AN HON. MEMBER: He's a Cecil.] He has shown himself in every position into which his official duties have called him firm and conciliatory, without crotchets, without vanity, without obstinacy, always ready to consider arguments, always ready to guide his course as sound argument seems to point, and withal, in his manner frank, conciliatory, obviously straightforward, obviously a man of his word, a man with whom men may perhaps differ, but with whom they cannot easily quarrel. Now, Sir, that is the man I apprehend you want in South Africa. I do not pretend that Lord Selborne had any desire to go to that new sphere of activities, for it was not so, but as he has put his hand to the plough, as he has made up his mind that he will make such personal sacrifices as are involved—well, at any rate, what he considers personal sacrifices—as are involved in this changed scene of his activity, I am confident that, difficult as the task must be to anybody sent out from these shores to deal with a country yet palpitating from the stress of recent conflict, if success is possible he will attain it, and if there be any obstacle in his way, if the remains of old controversies and old bitternesses are to make his task in any respect more difficult, who is it who is increasing those difficulties? To whom would it have occurred within the four seas to raise objection to Lord Selborne from the fact that he had been Under-Secretary for the Colonies ten years ago? The hon. Gentleman and the hon. Gentleman's conscience alone, so far as I know, to him and his conscience alone is it due that the very suggestion should have been made; and if any echo of our debates in this House reaches South Africa, and if the seed of suspicion is sown in the minds of any of our fellow-subjects of Dutch extraction by what has passed in this House, it is not Lord Selborne's career, nor any incident in that career, which will have done it; it is the ill-timed Motion which the hon. Gentleman has moved.

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he intervened as one who some years ago had the opportunity in this House of defending against the attacks of the right hon. Gentleman, then Colonial Secretary, and the present Secretary for War, the appointment of Sir Hercules Robinson. He admitted to the full that at that time, as since, when these personal questions had arisen, he had seen great disadvantages which might arise from their discussion in the House of Commons, because they really led to no practical conclusion, and they resulted in irritation without compensating advantage. But by this Motion every Member was challenged to express his opinion in regard to the appointment of Lord Selborne, and, that being so, he for one had no hesitation in saying that in his opinion it was an ill-advised appointment and not in accordance with the traditions of the service of the country. After the speech of his hon. friend, with its studious moderation—and in these matters the tone as well as the speech had to be considered—he for one would vote for the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman said a great deal in regard to the personal character and administrative qualities of Lord Selborne. Let him say that he associated himself with the mover and the seconder of this Motion in saying that they had nothing to say adversely to Lord Selborne as Lord Selborne. From what he knew of Lord Selborne personally and in his administrative quality he was of opinion that he would probably make an admirable High Commissioner in South Africa.

It was not with Lord Selborne that they had any quarrel at all, and this Motion was not aimed at him. It was aimed against the Government for having appointed him. There were two grounds on which he was prepared to vote for the Motion. First, he believed that it was a breach of the good traditions which of late years had sprung up in the Colonial service of placing these appointments, not in the hands of active politicians, but in the hands of administrators. The right hon. Gentleman alluded to it as a common practice; but it had been necessary for him to go back to Lord Durham to find a case in which a politician had been appointed to a colonial position except in the self-governing Colonies. Then the right hon. Gentleman referred to India; but India was, he contended, governed on an entirely different basis from our Colonies, and long might it remain so, The whole tradition in the Colonial service during the last ten years had been not to appoint politicians, and especially not to appoint politicians actually in the whirlpool of politics, to positions of this character. The office of High Commissioner had been filled by such men as Lord Loch, Lord Rosmead, and Lord Milner, men whom Lord Selborne would doubtless admit to be as able as himself —but very few Members, if asked, would be able to say what were the Party politics of any one of those administrators. In his opinion this appointment was a breach, an aggravated breach, of that very sound principle or tradition. If the Government had made up its mind to break through that tradition, South Africa was the very last colony it ought to have chosen for the purpose. Nobody could deny that during the last ten years South Africa, and the Transvaal especially, had been the cockpit of controversial politics. ["Whose fault is it?"] The right hon. Gentleman asked whose fault it was.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): No; I said nothing whatever.

General LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I asked whose fault it was.

*__Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON__ said he had no intention of entering into the question of blame on either side. Even if it were admitted to the full that the Government, and those who supported them throughout the last ten years, had been entirely blameless and faultless—and he doubted whether even the Government would make that claim—they could not deny that in South Africa there had been the most acute, violent, and adverse opinions as to the policy pursued. Into that whirlpool of contrary politics and contrary opinion, it was now proposed to send a man who had been a member of the Government for many years and a member of the Cabinet for five years. That was not the sort of man who ought to have been sent. Under present circumstances two qualifications were necessary in the High Commissioner, viz., absolute impartiality, and the fullest confidence of all sections of people in this country; and a man possessing those qualifications could easily have been found. It was necessary that there should go out one with a clean record in regard to South Africa, who would bring to the consideration of the problems with which he would be confronted an open, fresh and impartial mind. The Prime Minister had stated that Lord Selborne was going out to carry out the instructions of the Government. Nobody could object to that. He hoped the High Commissioner would always carry out the instructions of his Government. But what was wanted at the present juncture was not a man who had been concerned in the giving of instructions, and who was already imbued with the opinion and the views of the Government, but one who was absolutely free from home trammels and Governmental traditions, who would, indeed, receive his instructions from home, but who would send home free and impartial opinions. That was impossible with Lord Selborne. After ten years close connection with even the present Government, a man must have become more or less imbued with the opinions of his colleagues. They wanted in the High Commissioner what they were told they had in the Prime Minister, viz., an open mind, though not perhaps quite of the same description. The Prime Minister had stated that this Motion would weaken the position of Lord Selborne. If so, that was not the fault of the Opposition. He hoped that as time went on they might be able to give their confidence to Lord Selborne, but they must wait and see before they could judge how far that would be possible. He regretted that a personal question of this kind should have been brought up in the House, but he should vote for the Motion because he thought that under present conditions the appointment of Lord Selborne, admirable administrator and excellent politican though he was, would not best tend to bring that which they all desired, peace and prosperity to that portion of His Majesty's dominions.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have listened with the greatest sympathy to the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Poplar. I hardly remember a case in which an hon. Member was put in a more difficult position. What was his unhappy position? It is perfectly clear from what he said that he has no sympathy whatever with this Resolution, and he had to explain to the House why he was going to vote for it. He told the House he regretted these personal attacks, but he had to wind up by declaring that although he felt strongly the immorality and undesirability of making South Africa the cockpit of Party politics—he was going, nevertheless, for purely political reasons, to vote for the Resolution, of which, in his heart, he disapproves. The hon. Gentleman tells us this was an ill-advised appointment, and he followed that up immediately by informing us that, taken by itself, the appointment was admirable. He had nothing whatever to say against Lord Selborne; in fact, he praised him in terms that if Lord Selborne had been here would have made my noble friend blush. He was a great administrator, an honourable man, a distinguished politician; in fact, I could not myself have wished that my noble friend should have been more highly praised or more generously treated. Why, then, does the hon. Gentleman not vote for this paragon of administrators, this admirable member of our political spheres? Why does he not vote for him? Because he was appointed by the Government. Here is an hon. Gentleman who would reject the Archangel Gabriel if he were appointed by this Government. And then, forsooth, the hon. Gentleman preaches to us a sermon upon the undesirability of making South Africa a cockpit of Party politics. Because in our domestic differences, in the opinion of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House, the Government has made mistakes in other directions, the most admirable administrator in this country must be refused the valuable support of the hon. Gentleman because the Government has made the appointment. I suppose if right hon. Gentlemen opposite had been in office they would have selected Lord Selborne, but because he was selected by the Government to which they are opposed, at once they declare it to be an ill-advised appointment.

Why is it an ill-advised appointment? Apart from any political reasons, why is it an ill-advised appointment? Because, says the hon. Gentleman, of tradition. The tradition of whom? Of the Radical Party, I suppose. The tradition of the Radical Party, we are told, has been that no politician should be appointed to a responsible office of this kind; that the appointment is to be filled by somebody already in the service of the Colonial Office. When was that the tradition of the Radical Party? Not under the last Government, not when the hon. Gentleman was in office. I have an idea that to one of the most important appointments by the Colonial Office — the Governor-Generalship of Canada — a nobleman was appointed for whom I have the greatest respect and regard, who was nothing if he was not a politician. Lord Aberdeen was not a servant of the Colonial Office. He had not been a governor anywhere else, but he was picked out from a political career and appointed to the administration of the greatest of our self-governing Colonies. I do not complain of it at all, but I think it is a little too much for the hon. Gentleman to come down and lecture us as if that had been a permanent tradition of the Party to which he belongs. If it had been their tradition I think it was very wise to break it, for to confine to any service, I do not care which, the most difficult post in the administration of the Empire—to confine it to the very narrow limits of a particular service, would be one of the greatest mistakes you could possibly make. When I went to the Colonial Office I laid down from the very first, as I thought following the traditions of every one who had held my office, that while I would always give first consideration to any one who had served the State already in connection with the Colonial Office, yet I would never be prevented by any prejudice of that kind from looking outside the Colonial Office if I thought the situation demanded that I should do so.

What are the qualifications, as laid down by the hon. Gentleman, of the gentleman who should be appointed to a post of this kind? He is to be a person of absolute impartiality. Well, I sometimes wish I could find a person of that kind. But he is also to have, according to the hon. Gentleman, the confidence of every section of politicians in the country. Now, was anything more absurd ever presented to the House of Commons by a Gentleman who has held responsible office? I wonder whether the hon. Gentleman has ever heard of a great administrator named Lord Milner? He came near, at any rate, to his qualifications. When Lord Milner went out to South Africa he was given a banquet which members of all Parties attended. I am not certain that the hon. Gentleman himself was not one of the guests or hosts. At all events, the leaders of the Opposition joined with the leaders of the Government to do honour to this distinguished citizen of ours, who was a man of impartiality in so far as he had never expressed opinions or been actively engaged in any sphere which would have induced prejudice. They gave him a very cordial send-off and what was the result? This great administrator, who was appointed by myself in ignorance, at that time, even of his political opinions—indeed, I do not think he has ever taken any part in our local political controversies. ["Yes."] I am reminded by an hon. friend that he was once a candidate on the Liberal side. But that made no difference. I ask the House to observe and to recognise, as I am sure they will, that that made no difference in the appointment that was made. There we have an administrator who fulfilled the great qualifications of the hon. Gentleman, and how has he treated him since? What encouragement does his speech give to any Government to appoint a man who is impartial, and who has, I will not say enjoyed the absolute confidence of every section of his countrymen, but who, at all events, is recognised as not being in any sense a partisan, and whose appointment is, therefore, welcomed by both sides of the House? It is all very well in Opposition to establish this ideal, but the hon. Gentleman, if ever he is in office again, will find it one very difficult to realise.

Then we are told what is more extraordinary still, and leaves me in doubt whether I am wise in expressing the opinion which I have expressed—that it may be to the advantage of the Party on this side of the House that they should have a short holiday and return with renewed vigour to the perennial contest between the two sides at a later period—because, if we retire [Ironical cries of "We!"]—we on this side of the House—we are told by the hon. Gentleman what is the principle upon which he, and I suppose his friends, for he speaks for the Front Bench, are going to govern our great dependencies and our great Colonies. I never heard it expressed so clearly before, and I ask the attention of the House to its terms. He says we do not want a man already cognisant of the opinions of our colonial subjects. We want a man with an open mind, which very often means an empty mind. [Cries of "Balfour" and "Withdraw."] I am glad to see that the other side appreciate my point, and it will be made more clear to them when I continue the quotation. They want a gentleman of an open mind to take orders from his Government. The kind of man whom they are going to appoint to great positions in the Empire is a man who goes there knowing absolutely nothing of the conditions of the country he is to administer, nothing of the opinions held by those who really represent them, but a gentleman of an open mind who is prepared slavishly to follow the instructions of his Government without even interfering to represent to them the facts which he finds. Nothing more fatal to the government of the Empire than the ideal that is suggested by the hon. Member opposite whom we may in future see occupying a very prominent position in the Administration has ever been expressed.

I leave the extraordinary speech of the hon. Member to say one or two words on the Motion which is made. We are told, and I am glad that relieves me of any necessity to deal with the matter at length, that this is not an attack on Lord Selborne. Everybody admits that the only faults he has are, first, that he is appointed by the Government, and, next, that at one time in his career he had the misfortune to be connected with me. It is supposed, I think, by the hon. Member who moved this Resolution——

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: You did not hear my speech.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No; I did not. It was so much shorter than usual that it had been finished before I was able to enter the House. But, from what I have gathered since, it was much more moderate than I could have expected it to be, and I am giving the hon. Member credit for that when I say I understand his only complaint was of the two things to which I have referred. Why should my noble friend suffer in this great work, which he has, as I think, undertaken in a spirit of real self-sacrifice, although that idea was rather ridiculed when it was mentioned by the Prime Minister? Why should he suffer for his connection with myself? The idea is that, as I was no doubt a strenuous opponent of the Boer policy at the time we were at war with them, any one who had been connected with me would be prejudiced in the eyes of the Boers—I do not suppose the hon. Member will care a brass button about the opinions of the British population—and I want to say to the House that my experience of the Boers or the Dutch in South Africa makes me think that they are not influenced by that sort of personal spite and petty malignity which we see sometimes exemplified in English politics. [Ironical cheers.] It hardly needed a cheer from the opposite side to convince me how far all Gentlemen sitting there are from any sentiment of the kind. I was going to say, wherever it may exist, I do not think it exists in the minds either of the Dutch or the Boers. Certainly, I saw nothing of it in the generous and hospitable reception they gave me when I went there. I did not conceal my opinions, but that made not the slightest difference in the courtesy with which I was received. But I have got a much more striking illustration than that. The Jameson Raid, with that kind of loyalty and generosity which Dr. Jameson always showed, was admitted by him to have been mainly and principally due to his own action, and he suffered for it. ["How much?"] How much did he suffer? I do not know what hon. Gentlemen opposite would think of it, but it seemed to me he suffered almost as much as an honourable gentleman could do in the punishment to which he was submitted. But I do not want to go on to any controversial ground. What I say is that he himself generously and loyally admitted that he had made a mistake, and he suffered his punishment. If any one, therefore, he was a man who might be expected to be the most unpopular in the circles of the Dutch, amongst the Boers, in the Bond. Nothing of the kind. That man, disgracefully, as I think, abused when he was down by people who were not worthy of even his acquaintance, is now Prime Minister of the Cape, and I venture to assert that nobody who knows anything of the circumstances there will deny that, while they have two sides there as we have here, no Prime Minister of this generation has been so popular on both sides as he who has been represented as the chief mover and cause of the Jameson Raid. ["Hear, hear!" "No; you were."] I may have been so represented—I do not know—but my statement is that Dr. Jameson has been represented as being the cause, and he has himself admitted that in some respects he was the chief mover in the Raid. Now I revert to this for one purpose only, and will only say that the Dutch are able to forget an honest difference, and it is only hon. Members here who preserve its memory nine years after the occurrence, not really because of any moral indignation against the event ["Oh, oh!"]—no, not for that reason, but simply and entirely because they think they can make political capital out of it.

*MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had paraphrased what the hon. Member for Poplar had said, and his remarks were an absolute parody upon what he had actually said. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Boers were not animated by the petty malignity which sometimes animated his own countrymen. He had not always had so good an opinion of the Boers. He associated himself with all the nice things that had been said about Lord Selborne, but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham seemed to think that the Boers were so forgiving and forgetful that they would not remember who was at the Colonial Office at the time of the Jameson Raid. He was certain that, rightly or wrongly, the Boer population attributed knowledge of the Jameson Raid to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham and his Under-Secretary. The Prime Minister had appointed as High Commissioner a man to whom suspicion attached in the minds of a large section of the population of South Africa. Would the Prime Minister have ever thought of appointing a man to be Governor-General of Canada who was obnoxious to the French section of the Canadian population. Now the Government had appointed to this great office a man who was absolutely obnoxious to a very large section of the population of South Africa. They all desired to have South Africa a peaceful and prosperous colony with a happy and contented people, but they were not likely to achieve this by appointing a man of whom a large portion of the inhabitants were suspicious.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had made several remarkable statements, but the most remarkable thing was that it was precisely on account of his action that many of them on his side of the House found it difficult to know which way to vote. He should support this Motion because by this appointment the Government were continuing a policy for which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was mainly responsible. He thought the House would admit there was reason to reply to the statement that those who voted for the Motion would be animated by "petty malignity." ["No, no!"] The right hon. Gentleman would admit that he used the words.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I think I can recall the words I used. I believe my words were that the Boers were not animated by the personal spite and petty malignity that sometimes distinguished English politics. If the hon. Member fits the cap on, I cannot help it.

MAJOR SEELY said he was within the recollection of the House, and asked if the right hon. Gentleman had not indicated hon. Members opposite to him as animated by petty malignity.

*MR. SPEAKER: If that had been the expression I should certainly have called for its withdrawal. The words I heard used were those the right hon. Gentleman has repeated.

MAJOR SEELY said hon. Members on his side of the House deeply resented the words that were used by the right hon. Gentleman. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Withdraw."] He could not withdraw the allegation that the right hon. Gentleman used words which caused the deepest pain on his side of the House. What they realised was that Lord Selborne had been appointed to continue a policy which was supporting one particular Party in the Transvaal. Supposing the Prime Minister or the Colonial Secretary were now to say that they would fulfil the pledge that was given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, he should vote against this Motion and support Lord Selborne. It was not any action of Lord Selborne's that condemned the appointment; it was the action of right hon. Gentlemen opposite who had persistently refused to fulfil pledges they had given, not only to the Dutch of South Africa, but also to the English of South Africa and to our fellow-subjects in the Colonies who had helped us in the war. Because the Government had been guilty of this breach of faith they should oppose every executive act of the Government who had made the Transvaal the cockpit of Party politics. However good Lord Selborne might be, if he was appointed by those who had broken their pledged word he could not expect to receive the support of those who regarded honour above Party exigencies.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 178; Noes, 236. (Division List, No. 25.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galw'y
Doogan, P. C.
Duffy, William J.
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leifchild S. (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N Dorset
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. MacNeill and Mr. Keir Hardie.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt.Hn.SirMichaelHicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn.JA(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt.Hon.SirJohn E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.SirWilliam Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, SirR.B.(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir RobertPenrose
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William

Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Gordon, Maj.Evans(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir EW (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, SirJames(Staffords.NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, SirA.(Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, RtHnH(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F(Sheffield Brightside)
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John(KentFaversham
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, SirJoseph(Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W(Mile End)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.Fareham,
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James

Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt.Hn.SirFrederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. LionelWalter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, SirHarryS(Limehouse
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt.Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir MarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.JG(Oxf'dUniv.)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.

Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H(Ashton und Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W H(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question (March 6th), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for Committee on Navy Estimates)."—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. BUCHANAN, resuming his speech, said he hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would answer some of the questions put to him in the course of the debate. Up to the present he had given a very imperfect description of the Estimates. He wished to know first of all what sum they were actually going to spend. How much money was estimated to be spent under the Naval Works Bill? In former years they were always told the amount estimated under the Bill, and it was only in the last two or three years that the figure had not been given when the Estimates were introduced. For the reasonable consideration of the Estimates it was necessary that they should know the full proposed naval expenditure for the year. They wanted to know also in connection with the Works Vote what had become of the large item which had hitherto been in the Vote, and now for the first time omitted, for coaling depots, Wei-hai-Wei hospital, and Bermuda. Were these put under the Loans Act or not? What was the policy of the Government in regard to them? He wished also to know the policy of the Government in regard to Rosyth.

*Mr. REGINALD LUCAS said he desired to emphasise what had been stated by the hon. Gentleman opposite as to the great distress which was caused owing to the uncertainty of employment in the dockyards. He asked the Secretary to the Admiralty to remember that this was a most urgent matter in the constituency which he represented, and expressed the hope that he would, as far as possible, endeavour to avoid the great inconvenience which arose in this way. One remedy would be to employ, as far as practicable, fewer hired men and more establishment men. He agreed with his hon. friend the Member for Devonport that it was never a satisfactory system that the men should make appeals to their representatives in Parliament in order that their case might be brought forward there. A few years ago the Admiralty undertook to allow the men to state their case themselves. That was what the men desired, and it would be more satisfactory from the point of view of the Admiralty. They were not able to see the men last year, but he hoped that this year the men would be allowed to state their case in a straightforward manner. He raised the question of the sighting of guns last year. It was a matter about which there was then a good deal of public discussion. He did not lay much stress on statements which had been made as to the defective sighting of the guns. They all admitted that there had been a remarkable improvement in shooting in the Navy of late years. But it was a question of importance that the doubt which existed in the public mind should be dissipated. Information should be given as to what was being done to improve the sighting of the Navy guns. If there was anything wrong, they wanted to know what was being done to remedy it. The matter of target practice was one that interested the public very much. Referring to Admiral Scott's recent appointment, the hon. Member said there was no man who had done more for gunnery in the Navy than that officer. Admiral Scott was popular in the service, and no man had better deserved popularity. It was well that the Government should acknowledge the debt of gratitude they owed to him. He noticed from the Memorandum that care had been exercised in the selection of fans for our ships.

He was on board a battleship some while ago and found that the ventilation was as bad as it could be. On the same day he went on board an American ship, and there the ventilation was perfect. It was done by electricity on the American ship, while on ours it was not. It was a matter of satisfaction that this matter was being attended to. He could have wished that they had in their hands the Report as to the ships which were to be eliminated from the active list of the Navy. He hoped the Admiralty would be able to give the House some information as to what foreign countries were doing in the same direction. He further wished to know what position in the defensive system was allotted to the Naval Volunteers.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said his hon. friend the Member for East Perthshire had asked for information in regard to Wei-hai-Wei. That place was once supposed to be a most important station, and a large sum of money had been expended in making it suitable for defence purposes, but he understood that no guns had been provided. Who was proprietor of the place now? Was it still in our possession, or had it reverted to China? If it had reverted to China were we to receive any compensation for the large sums we had spent in making it suitable as a haven of refuge? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover stated a few years ago in admirable language that a naval base was as necessary for carrying on a successful naval war as a base was for an army engaged on land. The Government seemed to have reversed the whole of that policy, and from the scant information which had been given they seemed to have the idea that by means of wireless telegraphy they would be able to dispense almost entirely with this important feature in any naval war. He was sure hon. Members would agree with him when he said that if certain European Powers had impregnable naval bases they would be of infinitely great importance to them. He thought these bases were of the utmost importance in the defence of the Empire. In this connection he wished to say that Admiral Tryon laid down an excellent scheme for the defence of the Australian Colonies, his opinion being that it was of importance to have a practically impregnable naval base, where ships could go for repairs and await orders in times of stress. He wanted more information also in regard to the abandonment of St. Lucia, where money got out of the British taxpayer had been spent. He thought the hon. Gentleman ought to have said something in regard to the handing over of such important stations as Halifax and Esquimalt to the Canadian Government. He was not at all sure that the Government should have acceded to the request of the Canadian Government in this matter. It was this country which was responsible for the defence of the Empire, and it seemed to him a little premature to hand over these places to a semi-independent State without retaining to the British Admiralty absolute controlling power in the matter. He desired to call attention to a matter of local interest. Last year in July or August the German fleet visited the harbour of Lerwick, and lay there for the best part of a week. They spent the whole time in examining into the position of the town and surroundings, and the different points that might be advantageous in the future. Shortly afterwards a portion of the British Fleet came there. Why was it that the German fleet could lie there a week and only a small portion of the British Fleet could be sent there at all? They were entitled also to receive more information in regard to Rosyth, where land had been purchased at a fabulous price, seventy years purchase being paid for it because the view from a nobleman's residence was to be interfered with.

Mr. CUMMING MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe) drew the attention of the House to the fact that excellent material for aid in the naval defence of the country was to be found in the watermen and lightermen of the Thames. There was an occasion when London was in danger of being invaded, the enemy coming as far up as Greenwich. If it had not been for the watermen and lightermen London would have been captured. These men had had no recognition from the Admiralty, although their training on the river would render their services of great value in time of need. Within the last three years, 10,000, or nearly three-fifths of them, had volunteered to form a reserve for time of emergency, and offered to go for a month's training if the Government would provide during that time for their wives and children. He hoped the Admiralty would consider whether anything could be done to take advantage of that offer.

*Mr. LOUGH said that the position in which they found themselves illustrated the disadvantage of the Secretary making his statement at the commencement of the sitting instead of allowing the Member who had succeeded in the ballot to move his Amendment, and he was in the position of not being able to answer any of the questions that had been asked. The hon. Member who represented the Admiralty had made a very interesting statement on submarines, and on the internal administration of the Admiralty, but had given no explanation on the points on which the House really wanted information. The present Naval Estimates were the most important presented to the House for the last ten years. With the exception of 1897–8, when there was a reduction of £500,000 on account of the strike at Devonport, when work could not be done, there had been no reduction in naval expenditure for twenty years. On August 4th last, he appealed to the representative of the Admiralty to promise some abatement in the heavy charges of the Navy and moved a reduction of £160,000 which was supported by fifty Members in the division lobby Well, fifty was not bad to vote for righteousness. But many Gentlemen who sat on this side of the House did not support him. Those hon. Members who would not vote for a reduction of £160,000 were now going to vote for a reduction of £3,500,000. It was remarkable that the little band of economists who had been fighting for years under the most distressing circumstances should at last have been vindicated. They had been told to-night that efficiency could only be secured by economy; if so, why not more economy and still greater efficiency? One hundred and sixty ships had been taken out of the fighting line, on many of which money had been lavished in recent years in repairs. He was not at all happy in his mind about the eighty-four ships which had been thrown aside as scrap iron within three years, upon which the taxpayers had contributed also good money. He regretted these sweeping changes, and did not think it reflected credit on the management of the Navy. If the Government wished to preserve continuity of policy, they should not have advanced the Estimates so fast in recent years. He did not differ from the general opinion of the House in regard to maintaining a strong Navy. Every sensible person held that. But, that mere statement of opinion carried them no further. They ought to have some idea of what the cost was to be. In 1895 when the Liberals left office the then First Lord of the Admiralty said that it was desirable to make provision for more expenditure on the Navy, and raised it from £14,000,000 to £18,000,000. That was for the Spencer programme, and it was declared that that made due provision for the requirements of the country. Ten years had passed, and after gigantic efforts the expenditure had advanced from £18,000,000 to £36,000 000. The country would have been spared the present sudden check to expenditure, which the Government were now obliged to make, if there had been a continuity of policy.

What was the cause of the reduced Estimates? In the first place Admiral Sir John Fisher had been put in charge of the Admiralty. He had never seen the gallant admiral, but everything he had heard of him was to his credit. The great merit of Admiral Fisher was that he had done what he personally would have wished him to do; it spoke very well for his sound common sense. It would be better if the Government would simply admit that there had been a total change from wanton, wicked waste, and that they had embarked on a steady conservative policy animated with the spirit of economy, due regard being paid to the requirements of the country. The second cause was the by-elections. Wherever they went through the country it was found that the successful candidate at these by-elections was the man who went for economy. A light was striking upon the Government from those by-elections, and they would be willing to reduce any number of Estimates, and cast aside any number of ships from the active list, if they could only see their way to recovering their lost power in the country. There was, however, not much chance of that. Once bitten, twice shy. Why was the number of men reduced by 2,100 from last year? It was because the Government found they had been outrunning the constable. Some effects of their policy, however, would not be so easily got rid of as they imagined. They had got to repay the money borrowed for naval works. They had a splendid time of it so long as they were borrowing; but now came the time for paying back. Four years ago there was only £220,000 on the Estimates for repayment; this year it was £1,000,000; next year it would be £1,250,00; two or three years hence it would be £2,000,000. They should have avoided this wretched system of borrowing. The Government were not completing the works which they had commenced. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Where?"] Well, they had spent £20,000 on works at Rosyth, and had paid £120,000 to a member of the Ministry for land. Everybody thought that the Government were going to establish a great naval base at Rosyth to terrify Germany; but now nothing was being done except to meet the huge cheque for land payable to the member of the Ministry. Some consideration ought to have been given before these works were started, and they should not have begun if they did not intend to finish. The waste which had taken place in every part of the world in connection with these works was positively shameful. They hardly grew wiser as they grew older. He spoke with great regret and sympathy for the Government. On the whole he congratulated the Government on the immense reductions made, and if they continued these reductions on the Navy Estimates of £3,000,000 each year for the next three or four years, the country would far more readily bear its huge burden of taxation.

***The CIVIL LORD of the ADMIRALTY** (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham) said he wished to reply on the points raised with reference to his own department. The hon. Member for East Perthshire had said it was difficult for the House to take any part in the debate on the Naval Estimates unless they knew how much money was to be provided by the Loan Bill. This was a somewhat strong statement but it was strictly in accordance with precedents not to tell the House beforehand what was to be in the Loan Bills, or how much money was to be asked in them. That information would be given when the Loan Bill was introduced. As a matter of fact, it was impossible to do so until then, because the details of the Bill of 1905 had not yet been settled. They were still under consideration, and it must be evident to the House that the changes in naval policy recently announced had far-reaching consequences which must affect items of works as well as other matters, and these could not all be worked out in a moment. In regard to Vote 10, the hon. Member seemed to find it a suspicious circumstance that certain items, connected with coaling services, which appeared in last year's Vote had disappeared from this year's Vote, and he feared that they had been transferred to loan. Their disappearance was due to the simple fact that the works in question had been completed.

Mr. BUCHANAN: What about Wei-hai-Wei?

***Mr. ARTHUR LEE** said that that was in a different category. There was no change in policy in regard to Wei-hai-Wei; but in view of the unsettled state of affairs in the Far East, the Board of Admiralty had decided to hold their hand, and not to press on expenditure at Wei-hai-Wei until the future requirements there were more clearly seen. The question of Rosyth would be dealt with in the Loan Bill.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said it was understood at the end of last session that no more Works Bills would be introduced, and that the House would have a complete statement of the financial expenditure from each Department. Now, however, a new Loan Bill was promised, but they were given no idea of how much money was to be inserted into it, or on what the money was to be spent. He protested against this system of finance, which was quite a recent innovation, and a flaw in our financial system. He should vote against the Estimates until the Committee were informed what the amount of the money was which was to be spent.

***Mr. PRETYMAN** said it was not possible for him at that stage to reply to the many questions which had been raised, but he would do so at a later stage.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said he intended to take every means in his power to draw attention to the question of flogging in the Navy, which he considered was a scandal. No one in the House imagined six months ago that flogging in the Navy was an established practice. Twenty-five years ago flogging was abolished in the Army; but on board every ship in His Majesty's Navy there was a cat-o'-nine-tails as part and parcel of its equipment. It had been said that there had been a reduction in flogging in the Navy; that might be so in regard to adults, but it had greatly increased in the case of boys. On huge placards boys were asked to enlist in the Navy without the consent of their parents. That was because parents would not consent to their boys entering the Navy to be birched. At 12 o'clock every day on board His Majesty's ships birching or caning of boys was inflicted for the slightest offence. The police birch was only four-and-a-half ounces in weight, but the birch to which the boys in the Navy were subject was nine-and-a-half ounces in weight and was previously steeped in brine.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

THE CHIEF SECRETARYSHIP OF IRELAND.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) moved that the House do now adjourn.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."
Mr. Swift MacNeill.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said he wished to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury a question as to the position of affairs in the Irish Office during the last two days. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the Prime Minister had told the House that afternoon that he had had the resignation of the late Chief Secretary for Ireland in his hands for some days past, while the right hon. Gentleman had told the House on Thursday last week that the right hon. Member for Dover had not tendered his resignation. He asked the right hon. Gentleman if he had any communication to make in regard to filling the vacant office of Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant. He pointed out the desirability of making this announcement rather to the House than to the public Press.

MR. MCKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he wished to ask also whether there was any truth in the rumour that Lord Dudley had likewise resigned.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Are there any other resignations?

*SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD said he did not think he could be expected to give any answer to the question put from below the gangway opposite affecting the resignation of a Minister. [OPPOSITION cries of "Why?"] Last week it had been put to him whether any resignation had been accepted. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, 'tendered.'"] He was not aware that the resignation had been tendered. He was only aware of what the House already knew.

Adjourned at eight minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 7th March, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—Darien Gold Mining Company—(Petition for Bill).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Darien Gold Mining Company—(Petition for Bill). Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next.

Barrymore Estate Bill [H.L.]. Presented, and read 1ª.

Marylebone Chapels Bill [H.L.]; Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order), and committed.

West Riding of Yorkshire Rivers Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. The Order of the Day for the Second Reading read, and discharged. Ordered, That the Bill be not further proceeded with.

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order), and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

East Cowes Gas Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 27th of February last, discharged, and Bill committed.

Hammersmith, City, and North-East London Railway Bill. The order of Friday last referring the Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders to the Standing Orders Committee, discharged.

Preston Corporation (Ribble Navigation) Bill [H.L.]; Mexborough and Swinton Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]; Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.]; Truro Water Bill [H.L.]; Torpoint Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.):—

E. Lauderdale (chairman),
E. Beauchamp,
V. Hill,
L. Zouche of Haryngworth,
L. Kilmarnock (*E. Erroll*);

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday, the 21st instant, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; Nine Mile Point Railway Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Rhymney Railway Bill [H.L.]; Leeds and Liverpool Canal Bill [H.L.]; Clyde Navigation Bill [H.L.]; Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill [H.L.] Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.):—

D. Bedford (chairman),
E. Carnwath,
E. Northesk,
L. Monson,
L. Hylton;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on

Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz.:—

L. Torphichen,
L. Killanin;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 3rd March, 1905, declaring that William Eaton, rural postman, Wellingborough Post Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That they have added the Lord Monk Bretton to the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICANTS TO CHILDREN BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD DUNBOYNE: My Lords, this Bill is identical in its terms with the Bill which passed your Lordships' House last year, but which failed unfortunately to get through the other House owing to the state of business there. It is intended to remove a defect which experience has shown to exist in the original Act. By that Act, if a servant of a licensee serves a child with intoxicating drink contrary to the provisions of the statute, the licensee cannot be held liable for the act of his servant unless it can be shown that he, knowingly, permitted the child so to be served; and as the Act makes no provision whatever for the punishment of the servant, it follows that unless the knowledge of the licensee is proved, he cannot be made liable to the penalties which are imposed by the original Act for that offence, and the law can be broken without anyone being responsible. This Bill is intended to remedy that defect. It will impose no fresh liability whatever upon the licensee, but it proposes to make the servant liable to the same penalty as the licensee is now liable to for a similar offence. It will not in any way add to the responsibility of the publican; it will rather be a protection to him, for when the servant knows that he will be personally liable for his own acts he will be more careful not to infringe the provisions of the law, and will thereby protect himself and his master's interests at the same time. The Bill was fully discussed when it passed through your Lordships' House last session, and I do not think it is necessary now to make any further observations in moving the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Dunboyne.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

BISHOPRIC OF BRISTOL BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next

THE INDIAN FOREST SERVICE.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON, who had given notice—"To call attention to the scheme at present under the consideration of the India Office for the removal of the Forest Department, now at Coopers Hill, to the University of Oxford; and to move to resolve, 'That, in the opinion of the House, the Indian Forest Service should be open to all the Universities of the United Kingdom,'" said: My Lords, although the subject which I am raising this afternoon has not as yet been brought very prominently before the public, it is, nevertheless, a matter involving a very important principle, and one which is vital to the interests of all the Universities in this country. That principle, my Lords, is this, whether the right of admission to an important branch of the public service shall be confined to one University, that University endowed out of public funds for the purpose, or whether, as has always been the case in other branches of the public service up to now, the service shall be thrown open to candidates of all Universities alike on equal terms.

I think it would be best if I at once explain to your Lordships the proposals which are at present under the consideration of the India Office, and which involve the endowment of a school of forestry at Oxford to the exclusion of all other educational establishments, and, having done that, indicate an alternative scheme under which fairer terms would be given to all Universities alike. The Royal Indian Engineering College at Coopers Hill is, as your Lordships are probably aware, shortly to be abolished. The matter, therefore, which the Indian Council has to consider is, What is to be done with the forestry school at present carried on there? The proposals they have made are, in the first place, to transfer the forestry school from Coopers Hill to Oxford, and, out of funds provided by the Indian Government, provide there the necessary laboratory accommodation and establish and maintain a forest garden. It is further suggested that an examination should be held of all students at the end of their first year at the University—an examination which, presumably, will be of a very elementary kind, and that those who have qualified shall then be transferred to Oxford, where they will undergo, in the laboratories, the necessary scientific education which they require, ending up with a course of practical forestry in one of the scientifically-managed forests of France or Germany.

As soon as these proposals came to be known they aroused a good deal of hostility on the part of the authorities of other Universities, who believed that they would be shut out altogether from providing candidates for the Indian and Colonial Forest Service. I may say here that the Colonial Forest Service is equal in importance in the minds of those who have considered this question to that of the Forest Service of India, because the Colonial Forest Service at this moment is a large and growing one, and one which will have a very great deal of importance in the future. It is not, therefore, merely a matter of the ten students or so who now present themselves for the Indian Forest Service, but we must also consider those who may present themselves in the future for both the Colonial and Indian Forest Services. The protest was put forward most emphatically by the authorities of Cambridge University. Letters were exchanged between those authorities and the Secretary of State, and a deputation waited on the Secretary of State in order to set forth some of the objections which were felt to the proposals of the India Office. In answer to those objections the Secretary of State said "that it was considered essential that the Professor and the Assistant Professor of Forestry who have hitherto been entrusted with the training of forest students at Coopers Hill should be placed in charge of the training which probationers will in future undergo at the University, and in these circumstances it was inevitable that one University, and not more than one, should be selected for the purpose of affording the necessary education."

Now, my Lords, in that last sentence is contained the whole matter at issue—namely, whether or not it really is essential that the necessary training for the Forest Service should be confined to one University, and to one alone. Obviously this is not the place in which to discuss the relative educational merits of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, nor indeed their relative facilities for such training as would be required for this service. Reasons have been put forward by the authorities at Cambridge for preferring their own University in this matter—reasons which have a great deal to be said in their favour—and I may also point out that two Departmental Committees which have been appointed to inquire into the whole matter have reported in favour of Cambridge rather than of Oxford. But all these are matters which, of course, have been before the

Indian Council, and have doubtless been taken into consideration by them. I do not stand here as the champion of Cambridge as against Oxford; I do not desire to challenge a division between those of your Lordships who belong to the University of Cambridge and those who belong to the University of Oxford. The protest which I enter is not directed against the selection of Oxford University, but to the selection of any one establishment to the exclusion of all others, and to the granting to that one establishment of a monopoly of admission into an important branch of the public service. That, in main outline, is the scheme which has been put forward by the India Office —a scheme which, as I have shown, leads to exclusions and limitations of rather an objectionable kind.

The other alternative which has been suggested has none of these objections, and is an alternative which involves free and open competition from all educational establishments alike. It is that, in the first place, students should be free to choose their own University; that, when there, instead of undergoing an examination at the end of their first year, they should go through the usual three years University course and take their degree at the end of that period; and that, having taken their degree, they should then undergo an examination of a much more important kind, and should finish up, as in the case of the proposals of the India Office, by an eighteen months or two years course of practical forestry in one of the important Continental forests. By this scheme the public money from the Indian Revenue would not be spent at any one institution. It would go to providing an adequate training staff for carrying out that final two years course in forests abroad; and I think it will be admitted that that course of practical forestry in the Continental forests will be by far the most important period in the whole training.

We, in this country, have not got forests in which the science of forestry is carried out on anything like the same scientific scale that it is abroad, and as regards the proximity of the two great Universities to any particular forest, I think the one stands in very much the same relation as the other. There are no important forests easily accessible to either University. There are, however, woods which have been placed at the disposal of the University authorities, and which would be accessible to a certain extent while the scientific training was going on to both Universities alike. But the point is that it is the final course which will be the most important, and that course could be entrusted to the present Professor and Assistant Professor of Forestry now at Coopers Hill, to be carried out under their supervision. I do not intend to enter into the details of either of these schemes or to dwell on their relative merits from an educational point of view, through I think I am right in saying that all existing higher grade public services are at this moment filled by open competition from those who have gone through their complete University training and taken their degree. Therefore, if these proposals are insisted upon, this will be the first and only branch of the public service in which men will be taken after one year at the University or, in other words, almost directly after they have left school. The details, of course, must be settled by some competent body and I only mention this alternative proposal on the present occasion in order to show that it is quite possible to devise a scheme which will be more in the interest of the service itself than one confined to a University which can in no sense be said to have at this moment a large or important scientific school, and which, apart from the considerations of the service, will be very much fairer to all the Universities in the United Kingdom.

That is the case which I desire to lay before your Lordships, and I would urge upon the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary of State for India the importance of not coming to any hasty decision on this matter. I would ask him whether, in view of the considerable resentment which the proposals of the India Office have created, it would not be possible to submit the whole matter to an independent expert Committee—a Committee, that is to say, which would be composed of men of science of both Universities, or of all Universities in the country, as well as of officials of the India Office, with a view to coming to some more equitable arrangement. I should also like to lay stress upon this one point, that if any of the revenues of India are spent in providing scientific laboratories at Oxford, or at any other institution, whether for one, two, or three years, the very fact of public money being so spent would necessarily tend to render such a settlement of a permanent kind. The college at Coopers Hill will not be closed until July of next year; it does, therefore, seem that there is no immediate need for settling this question, and that it would be quite possible to postpone the decision. I would urge, further, that no public money should be spent, either at Oxford or anywhere else, pending the consideration of the matter by, and decision of, such a Committee if the Government see fit to appoint one.

I have not waited for the final decision of the Council of India upon this matter, because I felt it was of the utmost importance that some public expression should be made of the strong resentment and hostility that is felt to their proposal. If the noble Duke the Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, the Duke of Devonshire, had been here this evening he would have put the case very much more forcibly than I have been able to do, and for that reason I very much regret his absence. In conclusion, I would respectfully assure the noble Marquess who will probably reply on behalf of His Majesty's Government that the feeling of hostility to these proposals is not confined to Cambridge but is shared by representatives of every University in the country, and that it is a very strong feeling. If the noble Marquess can give me any assurance that this matter will be postponed, and that a full inquiry will be held into it, I need hardly say I shall be entirely satisfied. If, however, he is unable to give me some assurance of this kind the feeling is likely to increase and is sure to find forcible expression. Whatever opportunities are afforded for the discussion of this matter in Parliament will be used to the full, and I feel convinced that when once the facts of the case have been put before it, Parliament will refuse to sanction a scheme which is so unprecedented in its character, and which in its operation will be so manifestly unfair.

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of the House, the Indian Forest Service should be open to all the Universities of the United Kingdom."—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

Lord THRING: My Lords, I wish to say a few words on this subject. The proceedings at the India Office with respect to Coopers Hill College have been of a most extraordinary character. I happen to live near the college, and therefore have known everything that has been going on there for years. I admit that years ago the college required some improvement in its management. This improvement was effected, and year after year the college was praised by those who visited it and was lauded as being one of the most important institutions for supporting the Indian Empire. A great sum of money has been spent by the Government on improving its laboratories, and no human being can deny that it is extremely well managed and that everything in the college is satisfactory. Yet at this moment the India Office propose to abolish it and transmit the Forestry Department to the University of Oxford. It is absurd to say that the change of locality will improve the opportunities of forest education; indeed, there are less opportunities in the neighbourhood of Oxford than in the neighbourhood of Coopers Hill. Coopers Hill College is now at the very highest pitch of discipline and management, and, if it be possible, I trust that a Committee may be formed to again consider whether it would not be to the advantage of this country, if we are to have a college at all for forestry, that it should remain at Coopers Hill. Why on earth we should remove the Forest Department from a college which is extremely well adapted for it to the University of Oxford I fail to understand, and I hope the matter will be further considered.

*The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (The Marquess of Bath): My Lords, the subject of the Motion which my noble friend has put upon the Paper is one with regard to which I am regretfully aware there is a good deal of feeling, and I cannot help thinking that there is also a good deal of misapprehension both as to the reasons which influenced the Secretary of State in Council in formulating the scheme now under discussion in your Lordship's House and as to the results which will ensue from it. The noble Lord who spoke last alluded to the decision which has been arrived at to close Coopers Hill College at a certain date. I need not trouble the House this evening, for the matter is well within your Lordships' knowledge, with the reasons for the original establishment of this institution, but I will state, shortly, the principal and guiding reason which, I believe, influenced the authorities in coming to their present decision.

We found that there had grown up throughout the United Kingdom a number of excellent institutions which were fully capable of carrying on that engineering instruction which it had been the object of the founders of Coopers Hill to afford, and whose diplomas and degrees the Indian Government were prepared to accept. Now, my Lords, that affected the very large majority of the men who were educated at Coopers Hill. I must further remind the House that the establishment of a forestry school at that college was no part of the original scheme. At first our forestry students were educated entirely abroad, at the schools in Germany and at the French school at Nancy. For certain reasons it was found that that system did not work well, and at that time it happened that there were vacancies in the accommodation at what was known, more correctly, as the Royal Indian Engineering College, of which advantage was taken, and the forestry school was, therefore, established there. That was about the year 1885. When the decision was arrived at, not long ago, to close Coopers Hill, the case was very different with regard to the forestry students from what it was with regard to the rest. We found, as my noble friend has very truly said, that there was no organisation in the United Kingdom capable of providing the necessary instruction in forestry for our candidates for that department in India, and, unless we were prepared to revert to the old foreign system, which, in our opinion, had proved unsatisfactory, it was necessary to provide for a continuance of this school in its entirety at some other place.

I should like to emphasise that the scheme which is now under discussion is, and has always been intended to be, of a temporary nature. There were several considerations which influenced the Secretary of State in Council in coming to a decision, and, perhaps, I shall not be wrong in reminding your Lordships that in a matter such as this, where expenditure of Indian Revenue is concerned, the Secretary of State is powerless unless he carries with him the consent of the majority of his council. In this matter the Secretary of State was guided by the very strong representations that were made to him by the experts who were consulted. They represented that the number of men engaged in the study of forestry was very small; there are only ten a year, or, in other words, only twenty under training in this country at one time. It was considered most necessary that they should continue to be educated all together in one place, and should receive their instruction, owing to the peculiar nature of that instruction, from their own teachers, who are themselves men of great experience in Indian forestry.

And, my Lords, there was a fourth consideration, which I do not think was an unimportant one. It was felt that as the change was to be made it was most desirable, if possible, that a residential University should be found—a University which provides rooms and disciplinary supervision for its students, and where they could be brought into contact with their contemporaries who were at the same time studying for other professions and other walks of life. It was also felt that another advantage in this suggestion would be that the forestry students would obtain the benefit of instruction in the ancillary sciences, and that they would also have the opportunity of obtaining University degrees or diplomas. I had hoped that the principle upon which the Secretary of State had worked would have met with general approbation from what, I am bound to confess, seems to me its very great advantages.

The Secretary of State in coming to this decision had in consequence to consider the question as to where this instruction should be carried on. Now, I venture to suggest that if the residential advantages of a University and the supplementary teaching to be obtained there had not been considered so important, if the school had been established, say, at Reading or at Abingdon, or had been continued at Coopers Hill, no one would have complained, and no one would have had the right to complain; but in searching for a University of this character, and one not too far from London, the choice naturally lay between the two great Universities whose names are familiar to your Lordships. May I be permitted to say that throughout the whole of the conferences and negotiations that have taken place there has been no idea in the minds of the Indian authorities of preferring one University as against another; so much so, that attention was first drawn some two years ago, I think, to Cambridge as likely to be most suitable, and, indeed, the Committee of 1903 actually recommended the University of Cambridge. But the experts who have advised us include such men as Sir Dietrich Brandis, who was the organiser and founder of the Indian Forestry School; Dr. Schlich, the head of Coopers Hill Forestry School, and Sir John Ottley, the president of the college; and I venture to suggest that recommendations coming from such gentlemen are worthy of weighty consideration in your Lordships' House.

It was strongly urged upon the authorities at the India Office that practical teaching and visits to existing woods must go hand in hand with the theoretical instruction, and while the experts were satisfied—and I do not mind acknowledging it myself, as an Oxford man —that the teaching of science at Cambridge is more advanced than it is at the sister University, they represented most strongly that the standard required by Oxford was amply sufficient for the purposes of Indian forestry, and that, in addition, the situation of Oxford with regard to neighbouring woods and forests far outweighed the natural advantages of the other University. I do not want to labour the point, but I would remind the House that the Cambridge authorities themselves recognised at one time that it was scarcely practicable to place at Cambridge a forest school, which ought to be in or near woods, as Cambridge was so unfavourably situated for that purpose.

There is another misapprehension to which I would like to draw your Lordships' attention. There seems to be a general idea that admission into the forestry school, as it is proposed, will be of a close nature. We propose to transfer the forestry school, exactly as it exists at present at Coopers Hill, to the University of Oxford. The competition will be just as open as hitherto, and the examinations will be carried out by the Civil Service Commissioners. The one thing that we require is that these men, when they have been selected, shall continue their training at this University for two years, and spend the last year of their training in Germany. My noble friend urged in his alternative scheme, as I understood it, that the students should be allowed to settle where they liked throughout the educational centres of the United Kingdom, and that they should go for their practical course at the end of their career, as now, abroad. I have already mentioned to the House the objection which our experts entertained to that proposal. They considered it absolutely necessary that from the beginning the practical side, in fact what I may call the nature-study side, of the training should go *pari passu* with the theoretical and scientific teaching. It is of small comfort, perhaps, but I can assure my noble friend and those who think with him that so far from the decision being in any way the fault of Cambridge University, it is solely and entirely her misfortune that she is not better situated for the practical study of forestry. I would further venture to remind your Lordships that Cambridge University is not hurt by the proposal which is being put forward by the Indian Office. It is true that by this decision Oxford may be benefited to the extent of ten men a year for two years, but, as I have said, we had no idea in our minds of favouring that University at the expense of another.

My noble friend alluded also to the question of endowment. The proposal is to transfer the school bodily, teachers and all, to Oxford. The Indian Government will continue as before to pay those teachers, and there is a small contribution that will be made to one professorship in recognition of the fact that on the scientific side forestry students will receive instruction from the University authorities. But I desire again to emphasise the fact that this is merely a temporary measure; and I cannot help feeling that my noble friend was under some slight misapprehension when he said there was no precedent for such a course; for in the case of the Indian Civil Service, probationers pursue their studies at certain Universities, and those Universities receive grants or endowments from Indian revenues for services rendered.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: A number of Universities, not one University only.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH: Yes. Oxford, Cambridge, London, and Dublin, but not all Universities. That, my Lords, is a limited form of endowment, and if there is any objection to the course we now propose, it might equally be taken in the case of the Indian Civil Service probationers by the universities left out in the cold. I can undertake that the revenues of India will not be spent upon a permanent establishment at Oxford or anywhere else until the matter has been fully considered in the light of the experience that we shall gain and with the advice of the best opinion we can get. And if it will meet in any way the objections that are felt to this scheme, I can undertake that an inquiry, which shall include outside authorities, will be held before the close of the experimental term to consider and report on our experiment. If it is considered best, we are prepared to reduce the experimental term from five years to three, but I am afraid that we cannot with advantage to the experiment reduce it below that number of years. If you adopt my noble friend's suggestion you cannot stop at these two Universities. You must extend the residential permission to all the principal teaching centres of the United Kingdom, and, in view of the experience we have had at Coopers Hill, wherever two or three students, indeed, wherever one student, may be settled, you will have to provide him with his own teacher of Indian experience, at, I need not point out to your Lordship, considerable expense to the revenues of India.

There are constant applications made to India from the Colonies for forest officers—applications which are satisfied so far as it lies in her power. It is not a pleasant admission to make that there exists, at the present time, no centre in this country from which such officers can be drawn. I cannot help expressing the hope that the interest which has been aroused on this question and the debate which has taken place in your Lordships' House will result in the establishment of institutions whose teaching in forestry will be of so efficient a nature that it will be possible in the near future to accept their degrees and diplomas. I am convinced that in such a movement, if it does take place, the great sister University will take, as she always has done in the past, a leading and honourable part. It has been in our minds that we may be able in future to select our forestry candidates in this manner. But in view of the highly technical nature of the instruction that we have to impart, and the fact that we are bound to specialise our teaching, I think we are entitled to ask at the hands of Parliament that we shall be allowed to conduct that teaching in the manner which we consider best in the interests of India.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I rise to offer a few remarks upon this subject, which I think is one of considerable importance. The noble Earl who introduced it did so in a most admirable manner. He came forward, as we thought, principally to represent Cambridge, but he argued his case on general grounds of policy. I entirely agree with him as to that. It seems to me that if we are not to maintain with regard to this question of forestry the general rule which has been hitherto adopted, that all places of education should be able to send up candidates for the great Civil Services, we shall be creating a bad precedent. I speak not only as a Cambridge man, but also as representing other Universities, of one of which, a northern University, I have the honour to be Chancellor. I cannot see that the noble

Marquess, in his clear and able statement, has furnished any argument why this difference should be made with regard to forestry. As far as I can gather, the Royal Indian Engineering School at Coopers Hill is being practically done away with, because it is found that in many places of education all over the country admirable teaching is given in the various subjects taught at Coopers Hill. I cannot understand, however, why it is necessary to require that the pupil students in forestry should all be instructed by one teacher. Why is it necessary that they should all be obliged to reside at a particular University? Why are these requirements more necessary for forestry students than for the other students at Coopers Hill?

The noble Marquess the Under-Secretary of State for India has stated that this is a temporary affair. I do not understand that. The noble Marquess is quite ready to promise that there shall be a Committee to inquire into the working of the experiment at the end of five, or even three years. But I think that what the noble Earl, Lord Lytton, said is perfectly true, that if you once establish this school at a particular University it will be exceedingly difficult to remove it, and therefore an injustice will be done to a great many places of education. I cannot understand, exactly, the comparison between Oxford and Cambridge with regard to special advantages in this matter. Although not an Oxford man, I have not infrequently passed Oxford, and it has never occurred to me that it was situated in the centre of a great forest; and Cambridge, like Oxford, has within easy reach very large woods—in Bedfordshire, and even Northamptonshire, for instance. I do not understand, therefore, why Cambridge should be placed at a disadvantage in this respect. Moreover, Cambridge University can hold its own for scientific teaching with any place of education. I hope your Lordships will agree to the Resolution, as it is of great importance that we should not give an advantage to one particular University over another. I sincerely hope the Government will not commit us to the new proposal adumbrated with regard to the Civil Service, to which there is such great opposition.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of Lansdowne): My Lords, when the two old Universities compete with one another there is always a certain amount of animated rivalry. It is, I am happy to think, invariably of a friendly description, and I trust that in this species of tug-of-war which is proceeding between Oxford and Cambridge for the possession of the Coopers Hill forestry students the rivalry will continue to be friendly. I cannot help thinking that the amount of resentment which we are told has been provoked by these proposals is of a somewhat exaggerated character. For, my Lords, what, after all, is the case? Coopers Hill College, for reasons into which I will not enter, because the question is not now before the House, has been put an end to; and it becomes necessary to consider what is to be done with that small portion of students who have hitherto attended there for the purpose of studying forestry. They must be sent somewhere, and, on the whole, the Indian authorities have come to the conclusion that the University of Oxford offers the greatest facilities for the purpose. One thing seems to me obvious—namely, that this small handful of students could not possibly be scattered about over a number of different educational establishments. The noble Earl opposite seemed to think that the process of scattering might be accomplished without difficulty.

Earl SPENCER: There are Colonial as well as Indian sudents.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: The point is this. The study of forestry is a highly specialised study and can only be pursued at places where particular educational facilities are forthcoming. It was for the authorities to consider, and they did so with a perfectly open mind, whether they should send these students to Oxford or Cambridge. My noble friend the noble Marquess will correct me if I am wrong, but I am given to understand that when the proposal was put before the University of Cambridge the University authorities themselves admitted that they possessed no particular facilities for encouraging the study of forestry. I did not understand that that was merely due to the fact, although it is a fact, that the neighbourhood of Cambridge does not abound in those woodlands which are supposed to be desirable for the purpose of practical study. The result is this: that it has been decided to send this little body of some twenty students to study for a two years course at the University of Oxford. The noble Earl is horrified, because he sees in this arrangement a blow at the practice of open competition. I am able to reassure the noble Earl on that point. These students will be allowed to come up from any school or college, and they will gain admission to this forestry class by open competition, and open competition only. Therefore, your Lordships need not be in the least afraid that this proposal strikes an insidious blow at the practice of open competition. Then it is suggested that this is a dangerous discrimination in favour of one University at the expense of another. But what is the financial magnitude of this tremendous innovation? The whole expense of these forestry classes is to be borne, as it is now, out of Indian funds, and the only new financial element introduced into the calculation is a modest grant of £200 a year to the Professor of Entomology in order that he may deliver a special course to the forestry students. This is an experiment which is to be tried for, I understand, three years, and if the result falls short of expectation the whole question will be reviewed and an effort will be made to find some better arrangement. In these circumstances it would be somewhat violent for the House to take it upon itself to record, as my noble friend proposes, its solemn disapproval of the proposals of the Secretary of State.

*Viscount GOSCHEN: My Lords, I desire, as a representative of Oxford, to address a few remarks to your Lordships on this subject, though I cannot add much to what has been stated by the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary. I hope I may be permitted to congratulate the noble Marquess, as an old friend of mine, on his appointment, and on the able manner in which he stated the views of the India Office this evening. The real difficulty, it seems to me, is the smallness of the whole operation. If there were fifty or sixty students, they could fitly be divided amongst several Universities. It is desirable that these students should receive technical education at an early period of their careers, and by getting them together the necessity of duplicating the teaching establishment is avoided. The scheme of my noble friend behind me practically comes to this: that there is to be no school of forestry at all, but that special studies shall be relegated to the close of the full University course. The choice lies between keeping the school in one place and scattering the students so widely as to have no professorial teaching in forestry at any University. Supposing that Cambridge were to get some of these students. Are they going to appoint a special professor? No. The whole quarrel turns on the possession of some ten men a year. Is it worth while to set up teaching establishments everywhere? That seems to me the real difficulty, and I think that in this matter, at all events for three years, the general principle must be sacrificed for the sake of the practical result of keeping the school together. For the next three years there will be forestry teachers at Oxford, and Oxford will endow a professorship connected with a kindred subject for the purpose of strengthening the teaching of forestry. Far from gaining by this arrangement Oxford will contribute a notable sum to the teaching of forestry in the University. In these circumstances Cambridge cannot feel that resentment which my noble friend has described. Nothing can be more deplorable than that a feeling of jealousy or resentment between the two great Universities should be aroused over this small question. Coopers Hill contains some fifty students, forty of them engineering, and ten of them forestry students. Of those forty engineering students, Oxford cannot expect to get any proportion worth having. Cambridge is the proper place for the engineering students, and Cambridge will capture the greater number of those students. On the other hand, Oxford might well be permitted to capture the much smaller number of forestry students. I hope your Lordships will see that in the interests of practical education in forestry the scheme of the Government is better adapted, so far as we can judge at present, to the needs of the case than the scheme which was sketched by my noble friend behind me.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL: My Lords, I only intervene to say that the question is much larger than a dispute for the possession of ten men a year. It means that in the future all forestry appointments over an enormous area in India and the Colonies will be filled by Oxford men. Of this great influence Cambridge is entitled by its equipments and ability to have its full share.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, with your Lordships' permission I should like to make a few remarks in reply to some of the speeches which have been delivered, and especially to some points raised by the noble Viscount. The noble Viscount said that Cambridge would capture the very much larger number of engineering students, and that Oxford might therefore be allowed to capture the forestry students; but I would point out to your Lordships that if Cambridge is to make any such capture as that, it will be in the open market.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: So shall we capture the forestry students in the open market.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: Well, I think not. The noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs also stated that we were going to have open competition under the scheme put forward by the India Office. But if that is so, the noble Marquess can have no objection to the Motion, because I protest against nothing. All I ask is that equal facilities should be given to all Universities, and it is because equal facilities will not be given to all Universities that the noble Marquess will find it impossible to vote for this Motion. Students will have to leave whatever University they are in to go to Oxford to continue their course, and is it likely that any student destined for a course of forestry will go to one college and at the end of the year leave it and go to Oxford? In practice, of course, it will mean that all the forestry students in the future will be drawn from Oxford. I entirely disagree with the noble Viscount who said that it was a quarrel for the possession of ten men. This question is not merely one of ten students a year. If the Colonial Forestry School grows as it is promising to grow, in a few years the number of students will come nearer the fifty or sixty a year, which he says might fitly be divided among several Universities. The noble Marquess the Under-Secretary of State for India devoted the whole of his speech to proving that if it was a question, which he took for granted, of one of the two Universities, Oxford was the more fitted, and the only reasons he brought forward for objecting to the scheme I suggested of throwing competition open to all Universities alike was that it would be inconvenient if the ten students were not kept together.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH: I said it was necessary, in our opinion, that they should be kept together.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: Yes, necessary on the ground that they must have technical training in forestry while carrying out their scientific education; and, finally, the noble Marquess said that if the students were scattered over the Universities of the country the provision of teachers for them out of the revenues of India would be a very serious matter. I entirely deny that it would be necessary for the Indian Government to provide teachers of forestry in each University. I think you could leave it to the Universities to provide their own teachers and to give the necessary technical as well as scientific education in forestry. The necessary technical instruction can be given just as easily in Cambridge as in Oxford. Many of the landowners around Cambridge are ready to co-operate and place their woods and forests at the disposal of the authorities if this forestry scheme is placed in such a position that the University of Cambridge is allowed to participate. I am grateful to the noble Marquess for saying that there will be an inquiry into this matter, but I insist again on the point I made just now, that if money is going to be spent on the scheme at Oxford it is futile to describe it as temporary. I am afraid a protected interest will arise which is always found, in the long run, extremely difficult to remove.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: What money is going to be spent at Oxford?

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: I think that under the proposals of the India Office the sum of £200 a year is to be given to the Professor of Entomology at Oxford. I say that if any sum is to be given out of public funds to establish a school at one place, it is futile to call that a temporary experiment. It is certain that the scheme will eventually become a permanent one. While I regret that the noble Marquess cannot give me any further satisfaction with regard to the spending of the money, I am grateful that at any rate an inquiry will be held into the matter.

On Question, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 24; Not-Contents, 30.

CONTENTS.

York, L. Abp.

Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E,
Crewe, E.
Lytton, E. [*Teller.*]
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.

Esher, V.
Falkland, V.
Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)

Bristol, L. Bp.
Winchester, L. Bp.

Ashcombe, L.
Burghclere, L. [*Teller.*]

Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Denman, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Reay, L.
St. Levan, L.
Stanmore, L.
Thring, L.
Tweedmouth, L.
Wandsworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.
Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
(*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Marlborough, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Linlithgow, M.

Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)

Camperdown, E.
Feversham, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Westmeath, E.

Colville of Culross, V.
Goschen, V.
Hill, V.

Rochester, L. Bp.

Aldenham, L.
Ashbourne, L.

Biddulph, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Hylton, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Lawrence, L. [*Teller.*]
Mostyn, L.
Tennyson, L.
Windsor, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 7th March, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 63 has been complied with, viz.:—Seaham Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Darien Gold Mining Company.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Heckmondwike Improvement Bill; Wigan Corporation Bill; Bristol Corporation Bill (by Order); London County Council (Tramways) Bill (by Order); Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill (by Order); Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill (by Order); Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill (by Order); Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 1) Bill (by Order); Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

CALEDONIAN RAILWAY BILL.

"To confer further powers on the Caledonian Railway Company in relation to their undertaking; to authorise them or the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Company to construct a railway to connect the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway with the Clydebank Dock branch of the North British Railway Company, and to acquire a joint interest in such dock branch; to authorise the Callandar and Oban Railway Company to raise additional capital and to transfer to them the Leitir Mhor Pier and empower them to maintain, regulate, and charge rates at Achnacloich Pier; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (CRUISERS NOT STRUCK OFF EFFECTIVE LIST).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd February; *Mr. Edmund Robertson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 73.]

NAVY (DOCKYARD EXPENSE ACCOUNTS, 1903–4).

Annual Accounts presented, for 1903–4, of Shipbuilding and Dockyard Transactions, etc., with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 76.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 3rd March, 1905, declaring that William Eaton, Rural Postman, Wellingborough Post Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertance on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIES (REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS).

Address for "Return showing the methods in each case by which Representative Institutions have been conferred upon British Colonies since the Accession of the late Queen Victoria:—

Name of Colony.	Date and method of incorporation into British Empire.	Date and method of conferment of Representative Institutions.	Population, revenue, and area at time of conferment of Representative Institutions.

—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Copy ordered, "of Account of the Income and Expenditure of the British Museum (Special Trust Funds) for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1905; and Return of the number of Persons admitted to visit the Museum and the British Museum (Natural History) in each year from 1899 to 1904, both years inclusive; together with a Statement of the Progress made in the Arrangement and Description of the Collections, and an Account of Objects added to them in the year 1904."—(*Mr. John Morley.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Signal Station at Ballylynch, Baltimore.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state at what date the signal station at Ballylynch, Baltimore, was erected; and whether the consent of the landlord was obtained before its erection.

(*Answered by Mr. Arthur Lee.*) This signal station was erected in September

1891, on a site obtained on a yearly tenancy from Mr. Cornelius Regan, who, in making his offer to let the ground, stated that he was the "lawful tenant with all legal rights." It does not appear that the landlord was asked to consent to the erection of the signal station.

Staff and Salaries of Irish Local Government Board and Poor Law Officers.

Mr. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of the total staff attached to the Local Government Board for Ireland in the year 1896, and the amount of the salaries and emoluments; also the total number for the year 1904, and the amount of the salaries and emoluments; also the amount of the salaries and emoluments of the Poor Law and rural district (or public health) officers for the same periods.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The numbers and emoluments of the staff of the Local Government Board in the years 1896 and 1904 are shown in the Estimates for these years. To ascertain the emoluments of Poor Law and other local officers in the same periods it would be necessary to obtain the information from local authorities. Very considerable difficulty would now be experienced in obtaining such information, with accuracy, for the year 1896, and as it does not appear to me that any useful public purpose would be served by endeavouring to procure it, I am unable to impose the labour on the officers of local authorities.

Poor Law Officers and the Local Government Board in Ireland.

Mr. O'MALLEY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why Poor Law officers of Ireland are placed under different regulations by the Local Government Board at the present time than what obtained prior to the passing of the Local Government Act of 1898; and whether, in view of the fact that the Local Government Board have in their published Reports paid tribute to the efficiency of the administration of the Local Government Acts by the local bodies of Ireland, he will see his way to recommend the withdrawal of the late Orders of the Local Government Board, so far as concerns these bodies which have protested against them.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The general regulations under which union officers now serve are the same as those in force prior to the passing of the Act of 1898. The fundamental changes introduced by that Act necessitated an entirely different code of instructions in respect to financial administration, for example, union rating has been substituted for electoral-division rating and the guardians no longer collect their own rates, but are financed by county councils. It has already been stated that it is not proposed to withdraw the Orders recently issued.

Promotion of Poor Law Officers to Local Government Inspectors or Auditors.

Mr. O'MALLEY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there is any disqualification in the case of a Poor Law officer from being appointed to the position of Local Government auditor or inspector; and if he will give the number of Poor Law officers (non-professional) who have been promoted to those positions since 1838 (if any).

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The reply to the first inquiry is in the negative. The occupations, prior to their appointment of persons holding the position of inspector or auditor since the year 1838, are not officially recorded, and it would not now be practicable to procure this information. A Return is in preparation, however, which will give the information in respect to inspectors and auditors appointed since March 31st, 1899, and this Return will shortly be laid on the Table.

Gambling in Options.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has any further information respecting the working of the regulations against dealing by gambling in options and futures in Germany, Canada, and other countries; whether the Government intend to send representatives to the congresses about to be held at Liège and Rome; and whether they will initiate a discussion on this subject with a view to prevent International conspiracies of bulls and bears to operate markets.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Some information has been received from time to time on this subject, but the Government do not propose to take the step indicated in the Question.

Tonnage Measurement of Ships—Application to Fishing Boats.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether the Committee recently appointed to consider as to tonnage measurement will direct its attention to suitable deductions from gross measurement in the case of fishing boats as compared with trading vessels; and whether evidence from fishermen and boat builders will be invited.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Under the terms of reference the Committee appointed to inquire into the operation of Sections 78 and 87 of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, can direct its attention to suitable deductions from gross measurement of fishing vessels so far as the allowance for propelling power is concerned, and can invite fishermen and boat builders to give evidence should they think it advisable to do so.

Statistical Abstract of British Empire.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the table in the new Statistical Abstract for the British Empire, which purports to show the area and population of each part of the Empire, is incomplete, since it includes in its totals particulars of none of the African Protectorates, except that attached to the Gold Coast Colony, and since no mention is made, either in text or footnote, of Rhodesia, or of the Protectorates of British East Africa, Zanzibar, Uganda, British Central Africa, Somaliland, Northern Nigeria, and Southern Nigeria, or of British North Borneo and Sarawak; and whether, in future numbers of the Abstract, he will include in this or a supplemental table particulars, so far as ascertainable, of these territories.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The official statistics relating to the population and area of the Protectorates were too imperfect to admit of inclusion in the first number of the Abstract. There is a note on page 7 with regard to the treatment of protectorate trade. How far the desired particulars can be included in future numbers of the Abstract must depend on the information available at the time of preparation.

Education—Grants for Special Subjects.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that the expenditure for professors and teachers of special subjects in connection with model schools has ceased, he will explain why the Treasury still insist on receiving £2,000 out of the pupils' fees.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I understand that, of expenditure of £1,443 incurred for professors and teachers of special subjects in 1873–4, £300 is still paid for special teachers, and £300 more is paid in the consolidated salaries of existing model school teachers. The arrangement as to the £2,000 was part of a bargain made in 1875 which was entirely favourable to the teachers.

Exemption of Children from School Attendance for Ingathering of Crops.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether any, and if so which, local authorities have issued notices exempting from the prohibitions and restrictions of the Act (39 and 40 Vic., c. 79, s. 9) the employment of children above the age of eight years for the necessary operation of husbandry and the ingathering of crops for a period not exceeding six weeks, exclusive of the time during which the school is closed for the holidays; and whether any, and if so which, local authorities for any district have by by-law under the Act (62 and 63 Vic., c. 13, s. 1) for any parish within their district fixed thirteen years as the minimum age for exemption from school attendance in the case of children to be employed in agriculture, providing that in such parish such children over eleven and under thirteen years of age who have passed the standard fixed for partial exemption from school attendance by the by-laws of the local authority shall not be required to attend school more than 250 times in any year.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board have been advised that the result of Section 4 of the Education Act of 1880 was to confine the operation of Section 9 of the Act of 1876 to children who do not come within the operation of the by-laws. So far as I am aware, no Orders have been issued under the section since 1880. Thirty-five counties have adopted the agricultural by-law under Section 1 of the Act of 1899 for the whole, or practically the whole, of their area. It is also in force in many parts of the eleven counties for which new by-laws have not yet been approved since the Act of 1902 came into operation. The by-law has also been adopted by a few urban authorities.

Applications for Entry to Residential Training Colleges by Successful King's Scholars.

Mr. MORRELL: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he can state how many of the 1,506 young men and 4,245 young women, respectively, who qualified for admission to a training college in December, 1904, are desirous of obtaining a place in a residential training college, Church of England, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, or Undenominational, respectively, in October next; also how many, though qualified, do not propose to go to either residential or day college.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The numbers of men and women given in the table below are the numbers of men and women who were successful in the King's Scholarship Examination in December last, and who have informed the Board of the name of the residential college which they desire to enter. Two hundred and forty-six men and 1,877 women have given the Board no information as to whether or not they desire to enter any kind of training college. The Board have no information at present as to the numbers of men and women who, having passed some equivalent examination, desire to enter a residential college in September next:—

Class of College.	Men.	Women.
Church of England - - - - - -	708	1,084
Wesleyan - - - - - - - -	90	107
Roman Catholic - - - - - - -	27	159
Undenominational - - - - - - -	205	634

Vaccination Fees—Report of Departmental Committee.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the President of the Local Government Board when the Report of the Departmental Committee on Vaccination Fees will be presented to Parliament; and when a revision of the fees in question will come into force.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I propose to present the Report at once. The subject to which it refers is receiving my attention, but I cannot say when a new Order will be issued. I may, however, observe that effect could not be given to some of the recommendations contained in it without legislation.

Danger to Public from Overhead Wires.

Mr. MARTIN (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the complete wrecking of a City office caused by the fall of overhead cables, during a recent fire; and if he will take the steps necessary to secure the public from the danger incidental to the use of collections of cables insufficiently secured.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The overhead cables referred to could not have been Post Office cables because the Post Office has none in the City. Wherever such cables are used by the Post Office care is taken, as far as possible, to secure the public from danger.

Maximum Salary of Telegraphists.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the Postmaster-General stated on May 17th, 1895, that the maximum of telegraphists before 1881 was £160 a year but was now £190, he will state the number of operators in the London central office who are in receipt of £160 per annum and the number of years the senior man has been in receipt of this salary; and whether, as the official witnesses before the Bradford Committee stated the salary was now £160 per annum, the Postmaster-General will state the reasons which led the Department to reduce the maximum salary of £190 per annum being paid in 1895 to £160 now being paid, without hope of increase.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) My predecessor stated on May 17th, 1895, that the maximum of the class of senior telegraphists had been raised since 1881 from £160 to £190. The maximum of this class, now called the class of overseers and senior telegraphists, still remains at the same figure. Since 1895 the first and second classes of telegraphists have been amalgamated, but the maximum—£160 a year—remains unchanged. There are 326 officers at present in receipt of a salary of £160. The senior of these has been at his maximum since July, 1892. He has no practical knowledge of telegraphy, and is not qualified for promotion.

Utilisation of Peat Bogs in Ireland.

Mr. FIELD: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he will consult with the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture in Ireland regarding the utilisation of peat bogs in Ireland; whether he has had any recent Report from the Department on the subject; whether he will consider the advisability of giving a special grant to enable the Department to test the efficacy of scientific methods already successfully being worked in Germany and also by private companies.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) For the past two years the Department have been experimenting with German and other machinery for the more economical production of peat fuel. Articles on the subject appeared in the Department's Quarterly Journal, March, 1904. The conclusion drawn from the Department's operations in the year 1904 on the bog leased by them at Inny, county Westmeath, is that the failure which has heretofore attended the efforts of private individuals and others to develop the two chief branches of the industry in Ireland, viz., peat fuel and peat moss litter, may be attributed to the defective and, in many instances, to the mistaken methods employed. A number of residents in the district have now arranged to take over the Department's experimental peat works at Inny, and to carry on the manufacture of peat fuel on a commercial scale on the lines indicated by the experiment. The Department propose continuing their operations this year at Castleconnell, county Limerick, where experiments in the manufacture of peat moss litter as well as of peat fuel by improved machinery will be undertaken.

Sitting of Land Commission at Millstreet, County Cork.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can say what was the date of the last sitting of the Land Commission Court (Assistant Commissioners) in Millstreet, county Cork; and whether, in view of the number of applications for fixing fair rents, an early sitting of the Land Commission will be arranged for in this district.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) Between February and June, 1904. A list which will contain a considerable number of further cases from Millstreet district is being prepared, and will be taken up as soon as the present list containing cases from a portion of county Kerry is completed, but no definite date can yet be arranged for its commencement.

Technical Instruction in Ireland.

Mr. FIELD: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that the Manual and Practical Instruction Committee recommended that science teaching should be made compulsory as soon as possible in all the primary schools;

and, if so, whether, seeing that the teaching of elementary experimental science is not progressing owing to the diminution of the necessary funds, and that technical instruction in Ireland is impeded from the want of money for the erection of suitable buildings as schools, he will endeavour to meet those claims.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Manual and Practical Instruction Commission recommended that elementary science instruction (including object-lessons) should be introduced generally into national schools, and should be made compulsory as soon as teachers could be trained to give the instruction. A special grant was made by the Treasury in 1900, to be continued for a period of five years, terminating on March 31st, 1905, for the purpose of organising elementary science teaching, and for the training of teachers in the subject. With the aid of this grant the Commissioners of National Education were enabled to appoint a head organiser of elementary science and several sub-organisers, and to make grants of science apparatus to national schools in which there were teachers qualified to give the instruction. The Treasury have consented to continue the grants for the head organiser, Mr. Heller, and for two of his assistants, Miss Maguire and Mr. Ingold, permanently, and they have also consented to continue the grants for science apparatus. Arrangements have been made in all the training colleges for the instruction of King's scholars in elementary science. In addition to the 2,397 teachers trained in elementary science at the several training colleges, 3,774 teachers have been trained at the classes conducted by Mr. Heller and his assistants in Elementary Science, Part I., and 500 of these latter have also attended courses of instruction in Elementary Science, Part II. Instruction in elementary science and object-lessons is progressing in the schools, and there is no reason to anticipate that it will diminish in the future. As regards funds for the erection of technical schools, the work of technical instruction, as defined in The Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899, is, in most of the urban districts in Ireland, carried on at present in temporary buildings. The Department permit a portion of the funds allocated to schemes of technical instruction in urban districts to be applied to the repayment of loans for building purposes; but in the majority of cases the amount of the funds available is insufficient to admit of this being done.

Pupils' Fees in Model Schools.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether, since under the new rules model schools have been deprived of their special privileges, and that no ordinary national school sends any fees to the office, he will consider the advisability of entirely allocating the pupils' fees in each model school to the teachers.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The matter will receive consideration.

Children sent to Monaghan Female Industrial School.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if his attention has been called to a case heard at Lisnaskea Petty Sessions on December 31st last, where children were ordered to be sent to the Monaghan Female Industrial School; and, if so, whether he will explain why these children were sent to the school instead of the parents being prosecuted for their neglect.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The children were committed to an industrial school on the ground that they had been found wandering without proper guardianship. The parents of the children were at the time undergoing imprisonment.

Reconstruction of Poulduff Pier, County Wexford.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland when the works at Poulduff Pier, in county Wexford, will be commenced.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The working plans and specification for the reconstruction of the Poulduff Pier by the Department and the county council have been completed by the Department's engineer, and are being submitted to the county authorities for final approval, on receipt of which, steps will be at once taken to start the works.

Case of Constable M'Garry.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he can state what were the charges preferred against Constable M'Garry, of Musgrave Street Barracks, Belfast; on what date were the charges made against him; on what date was he sent to a lunatic asylum; and what was the date he was told that he had been pensioned off; what was the date of his discharge from the asylum, and what was the nature of M'Garry's discharge from the force.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) In August last, grave allegations of immoral conduct were made against Constable Thomas M'Garry of the Belfast Police Force. Whilst inquiries were being made into these allegations the constable became insane, and was removed on September 1st, 1904, from the Mater Infirmorum Hospital to the lunatic asylum, the doctor certifying he was insane. He was subsequently pronounced unfit for further service in the Royal Irish Constabulary in consequence of having been confined in a lunatic asylum, and was discharged from the force on November 30th, 1904, on pension commencing on December 1st, 1904. He was discharged from the asylum on December 12th, 1904, and on December 15th he was personally informed by the district inspector of his discharge on pension. The constable was discharged on account of insanity.

Irish Provident Assurance Company.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he will grant the Return standing on the Paper to-day relating to the Irish Provident Assurance Company.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Irish Government has no information on this matter, and no means at its disposal of obtaining it.

The Return referred to was as follows: Irish Provident Assurance Company,—Return showing the capital stock and insured risks of the Irish Provident Assurance Company, Limited, with the amount repaid to policy holders in respect of claims not matured; the proportion of capital to insurances effected; and the names of trustees, if any, for (a) shareholders, and (b) policy holders in this Company.

Taxation of Land Values.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that the city authorities of New York have practically agreed to levy a tax on land values on the area within their jurisdiction; whether the Government will consider the advisability of introducing a similar measure respecting the City of London; and whether they will give facilities and assistance to pass a Taxation of Land Values Bill during this session.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) As His Majesty's Government do not propose to introduce the legislation which is suggested by the hon. Member, it seems hardly worth while to inquire into the system of land tenure which under wholly different conditions may be adopted in other countries.

Gambling in Options.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that the International Judicial Congress, which sat last year in Egypt on the question of gambling in futures and options in the bourses of that country, has described the practice by a majority of the seventeen countries represented as a cause of evil to that country; and whether, in view of this finding, the Government will endeavour to arrange an International Congress with the object of preventing combinations to fictitiously raise the prices of raw material, foodstuffs, minerals, and shares, for the benefit of a number of operators, as opposed to the interests of manufacturers, consumers, and *bona fide* speculators.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) No opinion has been expressed on this subject by either the Plenary Commission or Sub-Commission on Judicial Reforms in Egypt, but it is still under consideration. A circular has recently been addressed to the Powers inviting them to instruct their representatives at Cairo to continue to study the question.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Conditions of Naval Service.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the naval authorities are aware that, in the official illustrated pamphlet "How to Join the Royal Navy," that can be obtained from the Secretary to the Admiralty, a recruiting officer, or at any post office, in which the career of a sailor is sketched, there is no mention of the fact that boys and youths under eighteen are liable for trivial offences triable summarily under the provisions of the King's Naval Regulations to twenty-four strokes of the birch, and to twelve strokes of a cane; and whether steps will be taken to rectify this omission in the pamphlet.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The reply to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is Yes; to the second part, No.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I will take care to supplement that this afternoon.

The Volunteer Grant.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of the Government to alter the incidence of the present grant to the Volunteer force; and, if so, whether such alteration will be extended to the Imperial Yeomanry.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): It is not possible to make any change in the incidence of the grant to Volunteers during the coming year, but I consider it most important that changes should be made in the directions which I have already indicated as soon as possible. The changes should allow of larger grants being paid in respect of efficient Volunteers and smaller grants in the case of those who are unable to comply with the full requirements.

Manufacture of Guns by Private Firms.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the contractors have recently delivered at the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, two 4·7 guns which are entirely out of truth, and also that several 12-pounder 18 cwt. guns are under plan sizes; and, if so, will he say whether the specifications for guns given out to private firms are the same as that for the Government Departments; and, if so, who is responsible for passing these guns, in view of the standard adopted by the inspectors in the Government workshops.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The two 4·7 guns which presumably are referred to are guns which have been issued for armaments some time and have recently been returned to Woolwich for repair. They were found to be slightly bent. Some 12-pounder guns have been delivered for inspection below plan size and are being lapped out before proof. There is nothing exceptional in this. Guns made by private firms and the Government factories are subjected to the same tests and passed to the same specifications by the Chief Inspector, Woolwich.

The Army Estimates.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when the Army Estimates will be in the hands of Members.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The date given me by the printer is the 16th, but I hope that it may be possible to anticipate that date.

MR. BUCHANAN: That will be within ten days of the end of the financial year. Have they ever been so late before?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I have said I am trying to accelerate them.

The Army Council and Army Reform.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the Army Council now approve of the changes in the Army adumbrated by him last year.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The policy of the Army Council is that which I explained to the House last year, subject to the modifications which it has been necessary to introduce in view of the special circumstances of the coming year.

Maintenance of Order in the Transvaal.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can say on how many occasions within the past six months it has been necessary to call out the military in the Transvaal as a matter of emergency in support of the civil power; what the nature of the emergency in each case was; and, if not, whether he will ask for a detailed report from Lord Milner.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): I am informed that on no occasion has it been necessary to call out the military for such a purpose within the last six months.

Chinese Competition with White Labour in the Transvaal.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to a statement in the *South African News* of February 4th to the effect that at the monthly meeting of the Johannesburg Trades and Labour Council a number of complaints were made regarding the employment in Johannesburg of Chinese coolies in trades hitherto solely followed by white mechanics, and to the statement that the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners complained that Chinese coolies were making and fixing sashes and frames in Terreira township; and whether he will make inquiries of Lord Milner as to these alleged breaches of the Ordinance.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have seen the newspaper statement referred to. I will make inquiry, but the statement implies that attention was to be called to the alleged breach in the ordinary way. It must be remembered that there were a certain number of Chinese in the Transvaal before the passing of the Asiatic Labour Ordinance and that to these the restrictions in that Ordinance do not apply.

Education on Ceylon Estates.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps have been taken to carry out the scheme of education for children on tea estates and other estates in Ceylon, which had his approval in September last.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I would refer the hon. Gentleman to the Answer which I gave on the 28th† ultimo to a similar Question by the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty.

Land Settlement in South Africa.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the total acreage acquired for land settlement in South Africa, the number of settlers, the cost of the land, and amount of advances to settlers.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I expect to have the latest information in a few days, which I shall be happy to furnish to the hon. Member in reply to an unstarred Question.

The Tibetan Treaty.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Chinese Government have expressed their adhesion to the Tibetan Treaty; what is the amount of indemnity finally settled; and during what period is it to be paid.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. As I stated in reply to the hon. Member for West Denbighshire yesterday,‡ the Chinese Government have appointed a Plenipotentiary to negotiate with the Government of India on the subject of their adhesion to the treaty. The amount of the indemnity is Rs. 25 lakhs, and is, I understand, payable, under Article VI. of the treaty, in annual instalments of one lakh, commencing on January 1st, 1906.

Upper Congo—New British Consuls.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the insecurity to the life and property of British subjects in the Upper Congo, he will consider the advisability of taking steps to appoint Consuls with jurisdiction powers at Leopoldville, Stanley Falls, and elsewhere.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1474.

‡ See page 406.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The information at the disposal of His Majesty's Government does not appear to justify the description given by the hon. Member in the first paragraph of his Question, but it is proposed to appoint two additional Vice-Consuls to reside at Leopoldville and Stanleyville.

Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state who, in addition to himself, are the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; which, if any, of the Commissioners are in the habit of taking part in the proceedings of the Commissioners in relation to the Post Office Savings Bank Fund; by whom and on how many occasions has any part been taken in such proceedings during the tenure of office by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer; and were the Commissioners, collectively or separately, consulted as to the policy of suppressing the balance-sheet of the Post Office Savings Bank, and the intended omission of the deficiency from the finance accounts.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt are: The Speaker of the House of Commons, the Lord Chief Justice of England, the Master of the Rolls, the Paymaster-General, the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. As far as I am aware, the Commissioners have not been summoned to meet since the establishment in 1861 of the Post Office Savings Bank. The business of the office is conducted by the Controller-General, with whom I am in frequent communication.

Post Office Savings Bank.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state what is the deficiency in the income account of the Post Office Savings Bank for the year ended December 31st, 1904; whether, having regard to the view expressed by himself to the House on March 15th, 1904, that for several years to come there will be a deficiency in the income account and the view that the taxpayer should not constantly be required to make good a deficiency in the income account, he proposes to submit measures to make the Post Office Savings Bank self-supporting; and, if so, will he state the nature of those measures.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The deficiency in the income account for the year ended December 31st, 1904, is estimated to be £113,785. I presume that the last part of the Question is intended to suggest legislation for the purpose of reducing the rate of interest allowed to depositors. If so, the hon. Member will find my reasons for not taking that course fully stated in my speech in March † last.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that if all the depositors in the Savings Bank came for their money the bank would be unable to pay them without making a call on the taxpayers?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That has absolutely no reference to the Question on the Paper.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Yes, but the question is what steps will be taken to make the bank self-supporting?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That refers to the income account and not to the capital account of the bank.

Remuneration of Excise Officers and Clerks in Collectors' Offices.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that officers of Excise employed in warehouses and distilleries are allowed extra remuneration when performing duty for an absent colleague; that these officers are not employed in single stations, as many as ten or twelve being sometimes employed in the same building; and whether, as these circumstances are closely analogous to those prevailing in collectors' offices, and inconvenience is caused in these offices when any of the staff are absent without a substitute, he will reconsider his former decision, and allow clerks in collectors' offices extra remuneration for extra duty performed under such circumstances.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxi., 1164.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The position of clerks in collectors' offices bears only a very qualified analogy with the position of officers employed in warehouses and distilleries. Their position, on the other hand, is absolutely parallel with that of clerks in all other public offices, and to grant them the concession asked for would involve its extension to the whole Civil Service, which I consider neither desirable nor practicable.

Fatalities on Electric Railways.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state how many fatal and how many non-fatal accidents have occurred up to the present time through persons coming in contact with the live rail on electric railways; and whether the Board of Trade is taking any steps for the prevention of such accidents.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): On the Lancashire and Yorkshire and North Eastern Railways nine fatal and twenty-two non-fatal accidents have occurred through contact with the electrically charged rail, including eight fatal and eight non-fatal accidents to trespassers, and one fatal and eleven non-fatal accidents to railway servants. No accidents from contact with the rail in question have been reported to the Board of Trade on any of the other lines which have recently been equipped for the use of electrical power in place of steam, and no such fatal accident has, it is believed, occurred on any of the tube railways. The number of non-fatal accidents of this description on tube railways, some of which have been opened now for a considerable period, cannot be given, as no separate record of such accidents has been kept, but the number, if any, must be very small. Recommendations as to the steps to be taken to prevent the occurrence of accidents of this character have been made from time to time to the railway companies and have been adopted by them; and the matter is one that receives unremitting consideration from the inspecting officers of the Department in the execution of their duties.

Mr JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Has there been any refusal on the part of any railway company to comply with any suggestion made by the Board of Trade.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, I do not think so.

Bath Female Telegraphists' Grievances.

*Mr. BARLOW (Somersetshire, Frome): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that three female telegraphists, who have been appointed at Bath Post Office for several years, have received orders that they are to be compulsorily removed to other towns, and given the choice of Exeter and Birmingham; if so, will he say whether they were informed at the time of their appointment at Bath that they were to be sent away from their homes at short notice; and whether he will investigate the circumstances of the case and consider the advisability of retaining the young women at the offices at which they were appointed.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The exigencies of the service at Bath, where there is much night duty to be done, render it necessary to substitute three men sorting clerks and telegraphists for three women. I have accordingly decided to transfer from Bath the three junior female officers. The present state of the work at Bath could not be anticipated at the time of the appointment of these young ladies; but this circumstance should not, in my opinion, stand in the way of their removal from an office where their services are not required to one where they can be made useful. Reasonable removal expenses will be paid, and ample time will be allowed.

Pay of London Telegraphists.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state his intentions with reference to the claim that the maximum salary of telegraphists should be increased; and whether, in view of the fact that the wages paid in English able companies and in the State Telegraph Services of France, Holland, Belgium, and Germany are in excess of those paid to postal telegraphists in England, and that the Bradford Committee recommended considerable increases, he is prepared to raise the salaries of this staff to the level of that paid for similar work elsewhere.

Lord STANLEY: I am not prepared to admit the validity of the arguments embodied in the hon. Member's Question; and I have no intention of raising the maximum pay of the general body of telegraphists in London, viz., £160 a year. But I hope to make some improvement in the pay of the cable-room staff of the Central Telegraph Office, which forms a separate establishment.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Having regard to the promise made to these men why is not good faith kept with them? Are they to be treated in the same way as the hon. Member for King's Lynn?

[No Answer was returned.]

Local Government Accounts.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Departmental Committee to consider the practicability of a standard form of accounts being prescribed for local authorities, which he announced his attention of appointing at the end of last session, has been appointed; whether it has taken any evidence on the subject; and will he say whether the Local Government Board's system of audit has recently been imposed upon the Corporation of Cheltenham as a condition of the Board's sanction of a loan to pay the accumulated deficits on the electric lighting undertaking.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): Owing to the illness and subsequent resignation of the Officer of my Department chiefly concerned with forms of accounts I have had to defer the appointment of the Committee. The vacancy has now been filled and I will proceed with the appointment of the Committee as soon as possible. With regard to the Cheltenham case, the town council have applied for a Provisional Order which will give them power to borrow to pay off an accumulated deficit of some £18,000 in respect of their electric lighting undertaking. With a view to preventing the recurrence of an irregularity such as that of the deficit in question, it appeared to be desirable that the accounts of the town council should be made subject to the same system of audit as those of county councils and other local authorities. The town council, who had themselves included in a Bill which they prepared in 1900 a provision for making their accounts subject to this system of audit, accepted the arrangement. They desired, however, that provision should be made for giving them power to incur certain expenditure similar to the power conferred by Parliament on the Plymouth Corporation last year, and I propose to give effect to their wishes in this respect.

Physical Deterioration Committee's Report.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has yet considered the expediency of issuing to parochial medical officers, sanitary inspectors, and inspectors of poor, leaflets containing the opinions of the Committee on Physical Deterioration relative to ventilation and the bringing up of young children, with a view to the dissemination of information on these subjects.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I have given consideration to the hon. Member's suggestion, but I have not at present seen my way to adopt it.

Mr. WEIR; Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that he gave me the same Answer a year ago?

Mr. WALTER LONG: Yes; and I gave the same reason. The adoption of such steps must be dependent on the advice I receive from my officers.

Secondary Schools—Fees and Free Scholarships.

Mr. CROOKS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the objection felt by local education authorities to the rules laid down by the Board of Education that the minimum fee for scholars attending secondary schools under Part II of the Act of 1902 shall be £3 per annum, and that the number of free scholarships at such schools shall not exceed 25 per cent. of the total number of scholars; whether he has taken into consideration the effect of these regulations in debarring from the benefits of higher education a considerable number of the children of the industrial classes; and, if so, whether the Board of Education will, at an early date, respond to the wish of many education authorities that the minimum fee should be reduced, and the number of free scholarships tenable at secondary schools should be increased.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): This matter is receiving the careful consideration of the Board. I will send the hon. Member a copy of a letter which has been despatched to the president of the Association of Education Committees on the subject. Briefly, the Board will not insist as a condition of grant upon the observance of any general rule as regards the amount of fee or the number of free places. Each case will be considered on its merits.

Local Authority (Default) Act, 1904.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the Board has determined to declare any local education authority, or authorities, in default under the Local Authority (Default) Act, 1904; if so, which these authorities, if any, are, and the circumstances which have, in the opinion of the Board of Education, rendered the application of the Default Act necessary; and whether he will lay Papers containing the correspondence between the Board of Education and such local authority or authorities, if any, now in default which has led the Board to the decision to apply the Default Act.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: The Board of Education are in communication with more than one local education authority in respect of matters which might call for the application of the Local Authority (Default) Act, 1904. These communications are still proceeding.

Dr. MACNAMARA: Has the Default Act not yet been applied in respect of any authority?

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: Not yet.

Teaching of the Irish Language in Schools.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that the London County Council has decided to accept Irish as a modern language at its examinations for clerkships; and whether, in issuing the new Code, he will specify that Irish may be included amongst the subjects for elementary day and evening schools.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: No alteration of the regulations of the Board appears to be necessary. There is nothing in the existing regulations which prevents Irish being taught in any day or evening school where the Board are satisfied that it is a suitable subject of instruction.

Battery Park, Stornoway—Sites for Fishermen's Dwellings.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he will state whether the whole of the twenty-nine feus offered as sites for fishermen's dwellings at the Battery Park, Stornoway, have now been allocated, and what progress has been made with the construction of the houses.

*The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton): According to the latest information only twenty feus have been allocated. The contractor has informed the Congested Districts Board that, with favourable weather, he hopes to finish the twenty houses contracted for by the end of April.

Shader Landing Place, Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he will state the cause of the delay in proceeding with the work at the Shader Landing Place, Lewis, Ross-shire.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The Congested Districts Board on June 4th, 1901, offered a grant of £270 to the County Council of Ross to aid in the execution of the work in question. On the 13th ultimo the county clerk asked that the offer of the grant should be kept open until May 15th next, and the Board have consented.

Milk Supply—Government Inspection of Stock.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate, having regard to the fact that Dr. Chalmers, the Medical Officer of Health for Glasgow, states that the epidemic of sore throat at the Belvedere Hospital in that city last summer was due to teat eruption in the stock at the farm from which the milk supply was obtained, will he consider the expediency of introducing legislation such as will secure the periodical inspection of stock kept for the supply of milk to public dairies.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: Under No. 14 of the Local Government Board Draft Regulations for regulating the duties of sanitary inspectors, which are in force over almost all Scotland, those officers are bound to visit dairies, cowsheds, and milkshops at least once in every three months. Legislation on this subject, therefore, appears to be unnecessary.

Scottish Congested Districts Board—Loans to Fishermen.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether the Congested Districts Board will consider the expediency of making loans to fishermen in congested districts for the purchase of boats and gear.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The question of making loans to fishermen has engaged the attention of the Secretary for Scotland, but he can come to no decision on the matter pending the Report of the Committee of Inquiry recently appointed by his predecessor.

Thompson-Orpen Estate, Millstreet, County Cork.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that, in connection with legal proceedings on the Thompson-Orpen Estate, near Millstreet, county Cork, some members of the Constabulary force (including Sergeant Lee and Constable Cahill) have urged the tenants to pay the old rents and otherwise intervened in matters outside their ordinary duties; and, if so, will the Constabulary authorities take action in this matter.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I am informed that the suggestion in this Question is absolutely devoid of foundation.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that ejectment decrees have been obtained against several tenants on the Thompson-Orpen Estate, near Millstreet, county Cork, for the non-payment of one year's rent, including the hanging gale; and whether, in view of the fact that purchase negotiations were in progress, and in consequence of the terms demanded by the landlords the tenants had served originating notices to fix fair rents, he will consider the advisability of withholding the forces of the Crown for the purpose of the proposed eviction.

MR. ATKINSON: The tenants on this estate refused to pay their rents because the landlord would not sell to them at their own terms. Subsequently a party of armed men visited several of the tenants, fired shots, and warned them not to pay. Two arrests have been made in connection with this occurrence, and the accused have been returned for trial at the next Assizes. The landlord has obtained ejectment decrees against ten of the tenants. The Executive are bound in law to afford protection to the sheriff in the execution of the King's Writs.

MR. FLYNN: Is not this a case in which an administrative solution might be found?

MR. ATKINSON: We are bound by law to give the protection asked for.

Case of H. J. Livingstone, of Newry.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state by what official and on whose representations it was decided not to execute the warrant issued against H. J. Livingstone, late of Newry and now in Canada; whether, in addition to the Fearon case, he was concerned in the malversation of the funds of the Urban Council of Newry; and whether it is intended to apply for Livingstone's extradition in view of the fact that he absconded.

Mr. ATKINSON: After the issue of the warrant on Fearon's information, Livingstone absconded, it was believed to Canada. It then became necessary to consider whether extradition should be applied for in case his whereabouts was ascertained, and with that object it was necessary to examine whether there was any evidence available to sustain the general charge made on Fearon's information. No such evidence was available, and accordingly the Inspector-General, acting on the instructions of Government, was advised not to execute the warrant. After Livingstone had absconded it was reported to the district inspector that he had misapplied moneys belonging to the urban council, but the council declined to make any information or give any guarantee for repayment of the expenses of his conveyance from America, if arrested there. In these circumstances, no application was made by the Crown for his extradition. The urban council have now instituted proceedings to recover the amount of the defalcations from Livingstone's sureties as rate collector.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Seeing that the resident magistrate at Newry was satisfied there was a *prima facie* case, what right had a permanent official in Dublin Castle to reverse in secret a decision arrived at in public?

Mr. ATKINSON: It was necessary when it was discovered that Livingstone had absconded to ascertain whether there was evidence that could be laid before the Canadian or American Court to justify the application for extradition.

Mr. MACVEAGH: But what right had the Dublin Castle official to reverse the decision of the magistrate?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question on the Paper has been answered.

Mr. MACVEAGH: With due respect, Sir, it has not. I asked by what official, and on whose representations justice was defeated in this case.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must give notice of any further Question.

Mr. MACVEAGH: The right hon. Gentleman has not told me the name of the official who did this.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Question may be answered though no name was given.

The Handwriting Expert in Sergeant Sullivan's Case.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if Mr. T. P. Nolan was consulted as a handwriting expert in the course of the charges brought against Sergeant Sullivan, of Mulranny, county Mayo; and, if so, whether he expressed any opinion as to the authorship of the letters inciting to outrage, and alleged to be written by Sergeant Sullivan.

Mr. ATKINSON: In answer to this Question I beg to refer to the reply to the similar inquiry addressed to my right hon. friend by the hon. Member for Cork on October 20th, † 1902.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is it in order for a Minister thus to refer to a reply given three years ago.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: On a point of order, would it not be better for him not to answer at all than thus to refer to another Question?

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxiii., 211

King-Harman Estate, Boyle.

Mr. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that in connection with the sale of the King-Harman Estate some of the direct tenants in the town of Boyle have their purchase agreements completed, he will explain why other tenants who hold directly have been excluded from the sale; whether sub-tenants have been excluded from the sale and no attempt at negotiation with the middleman made by the Estates Commissioners; and whether such negotiation is one of the functions of the Commissioners.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper:—

Mr. JAMES O'KELLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in connection with the sale of the King-Harman Estate, at Boyle, in the county of Roscommon, the entire of the estate of all descriptions has been sold to the Estates Commissioners; and, if not, whether he can state the character of the excluded portion, and why it was excluded.

Mr. JAMES O'KELLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners were duly notified by the tenants of the King-Harman Estate that they agreed to the purchase by the Commissioners on the grounds that the Commissioners would buy up any untenanted land, non-residential holdings, or other portions of the estate that might be available for redistribution amongst the tenants; whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any and what steps to secure such lands for the purpose mentioned; and whether several of the occupiers of such lands have expressed their willingness to sell their interests to the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Commissioners have arranged to purchase the entire of the estate, save the demesne, certain portions of the town of Boyle, the houses in which are occupied by sub-tenants, and certain other portions where the houses are occupied by weekly and monthly tenants at very low rents. The Judical Commissioner has decided that advances cannot be made to middlemen who have wholly sublet their holdings, and in the case of weekly and monthly tenants the Commissioner considers the security for advances inadequate. The tenants' representatives deny that they entered into agreements to purchase their holdings on any such condition as is mentioned, and stated that they did not wish to withdraw from their bargains. Some of the tenants of non-residential farms have expressed their willingness to sell their holdings to the Estates Commissioners, and negotiations are proceeding.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): Have the Commissioners entered into negotiations with middlemen in the town for the sale of their holdings to the occupiers, and are they willing to sell?

Mr. ATKINSON: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Belfast Water Supply—Mourne Catchment Area.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that the Belfast Water Commissioners propose to prohibit, after May 1st, the letting of lands within the Mourne catchment area; whether he is aware that before the Commissioners obtained their Bill the parties concerned were led to believe that no local industry would be prejudicially affected; whether he is aware that the operations of the Commissioners have since resulted in the closing of several granite quarries, and that the prohibition of the letting of lands will now injure the sheep-breeding industry, the two chief means of livelihood in the district; and, if so, whether any steps can be taken by the Estates Commissioners or the Department of Agriculture to safeguard the rights of the residents.

Mr. ATKINSON: I am informed by the secretary to the Water Commissioners that the catchment area of the waterworks comprises but a very small portion of the lands in the district available for sheep grazing, and that the Commissioners when acquiring the lands compensated the parties interested in the grazing. In order to avoid any danger of pollution of the water supply they have also decided to discontinue in future the letting of the lands for grazing. No quarrying has been done on the Commissioners' lands during the past two years, and no persons have the right of quarrying there. Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Estates Commissioners have any jurisdiction to interfere in the matter.

Revaluation of Licensed Houses in Belfast.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the decision of the Court of Appeal in the case of Armstrong *v.* the Commissioner of Valuation; and whether, in view of the fact that that decision lays down the principle that in valuing all business houses the volume of business done is to be taken into account, and that that principle has been applied in the revaluation of Belfast to licensed houses only, he proposes to take any action towards suspending that revaluation till the error committed by the Commissioner of Valuation has been rectified.

MR. ATKINSON: The revaluation of Belfast has been carried out strictly in accordance with the principles laid down in the Valuation Acts, and that this has been correctly done in the case of both licensed and unlicensed houses is confirmed both by the result of the many appeals to the Recorder of Belfast, and by the recent decision of the Court of Appeal. There is no intention of postponing the coming into force of the revaluation.

Irish Estates Commissioners' Report.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he state when the Report of the Estates Commissioners on the first year's working of the Irish Land Act of 1903 will be published.

MR. ATKINSON: An Interim Report of the proceedings of the Commissioners to December 31st, 1904, is in preparation and, it is expected, will be laid on the Table of the House during the present month.

Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can state the total reduction which has taken place in the Royal Irish Constabulary since the passing of the Land Act, 1903, and the proportion of officers which has been included in such reduction.

MR. ATKINSON: The total reduction which has taken place in the strength of the Royal Irish Constabulary since the passing of the Act of 1903 is 753 men, including 2 officers.

Pay of Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what is the amount of the average salary and emoluments, including all extras and expenses, of a county inspector, district inspector, sergeant, and ordinary constable of the Royal Irish Constabulary respectively.

MR. ATKINSON: The figures are £621; £340; £84 5s.; and £62, respectively.

Maryborough Police Force.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the reasons for continuing the services of a county inspector and district inspector of the Royal Irish Constabulary in Maryborough, Queen's County; how many men are told off as servants to those two officials; and whether he will consider the advisability of retaining only a head constable, sergeant, and four or five constables for the district.

MR. ATKINSON: The services of a county and district inspector are retained at Maryborough because it is the most centrally situated town in the county, and because the requirements of the public service necessitate their retention at this station. No members of the Constabulary act as servants to these officers, and it is not proposed to make any reduction in the strength of the force at Maryborough.

Grazing Farm at Toneymore.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a large grazing farm held on the eleven-months system is available at Toneymore, parish of Abbeylara, barony of Granard, for purchase for the evicted tenants; and will he direct the attention of the Commissioners to this property with a view to their making an offer for it.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Commissioners have no knowledge of the farm in question, but will be prepared to consider its purchase in the event of the estate upon which it is situated being brought before them to be dealt with.

Irish Land Purchase Act.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, will he state the reasons which influenced the announcement that no further sales of towns in Ireland would be sanctioned under the Land Purchase Act of 1903; whether, in view of the pledges given during the passage of the Act, will the matter be now left an open one for the decision of the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. ATKINSON: The reasons are that the entire purpose and object of the Land Purchase Code was to deal with the sale and purchase of holdings of land, and that it was never contemplated by Parliament to apply the funds provided by those Acts to the purchase of property in towns. And, further, that in practice it has been found impossible to make advances for the resale of small houses in the occupation of town tenants, as the security is quite inadequate. I am not aware that any pledges of the kind mentioned have been given. The Estates Commissioners can, of course, refer this point for decision in any particular case which may come before them.

Mr. HAYDEN inquired if the Commissioners had not made advances for the purchase of town holdings. Who was responsible for altering the intentions of the Commissioners in respect of the working of the Act?

Mr. ATKINSON said he was not aware of the fact stated by the hon. Member.

Mr. HAYDEN: Was not the town of Boyle a case in point?

Mr. Atkinson's reply was inaudible.

Irish Science—Instruction Grant.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is proposed to stop the grant for organising practical science teaching in Irish national schools; and, if so, will he state the grounds on which such decision has been arrived at, in view of the fact that the Commission on Manual and Practical Instruction recommended the teaching of elementary experimental science in Irish primary schools.

Mr. ATKINSON: A reply to this Question cannot conveniently be given across the floor of the House. I would ask the hon. Gentleman to await the reply which I am giving at some length to the similar unstarred Question of today† in the name of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick's Division, and which will be circulated in the morning.

School Age Regulations in Ireland.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have in their new regulations made a rule that no boy under eight years of age shall be enrolled in a male school; and whether any provision has been made for compensating teachers who will suffer under this rule.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Commissioners have found that boys under eight years of age have received little or no instruction in schools where there were no mistresses, and especially in schools with only one master. The tender ages of these children necessitate instruction of a special character, and the Commissioners are convinced that women are more fitted to impart this instruction than men. The rule has been made solely in the interests of the children, and the necessity for such a rule was strongly pointed out in Mr. Dale's Report on primary education. With respect to the concluding inquiry there is no evidence yet that teachers, generally, will be in any way sufferers under the rule.

---

† See page 562.

Irish Education—Mr. Dale's Report.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when he will lay upon the Table the observations of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland on Mr. Dale's Report.

MR. ATKINSON: The general purport of the observations of the Commissioners on the Report made by Mr. Dale is embodied in their Annual Report recently presented to Parliament. It is not proposed to lay on the Table of the House any further official communications from the Commissioners in the matter.

Tipperary Courthouse.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the South Tipperary County Council will be expected to pay rent for and maintain the county Courthouse, over which they are not permitted to exercise any control whatever, and which the sheriff without recognition of their views and obligations allows the use of, amongst others, for a tea and bridge club.

MR. ATKINSON: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. I have already explained that the sheriff, in accordance with a practice of many years standing, has, with the general assent of the community and, I understand, of the majority of the county council and to the inconvenience of no person, permitted a portion of the Courthouse called the Assembly Rooms to be used for social amusements.

Irish Agricultural Department—Miss Anderson's Appointment.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he will state the terms of Miss Anderson's temporary appointment as inspector under the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, and her qualifications for her work; on what date was her recent report on the class in Limerick received by the Department; what steps have the Department taken to satisfy themselves of the fairness of her report; will the Department require the teacher to modify her teaching to suit the views of the inspector in opposition to the views of the purchasers of the goods; and will he say what sources of information do the Department possess, apart from this inspector's reports, as to the condition and progress of the knitting and hosiery industry in Ireland.

MR. ATKINSON: Miss Anderson is paid a salary at the rate of £200 per annum and her appointment is renewable every six months. She has been regularly employed by the Department since August, 1900. Her qualifications were stated in answer to the hon. Member's previous Question of February 27th.† Her report on the class in Limerick was received by the Department on January 14th. The Department are satisfied as to the fairness of that report, and will require the teacher to remedy the defects to which attention was called. The Department have many sources of information as to the condition and progress of the hosiery knitting industry in Ireland, including special reports of experts in the trade.

Irish Post Office and the Irish Language

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the inconvenience caused to Mr. Thomas Murphy, of Booterstown, county Dublin, through the failure of the postal officials to deliver a letter, addressed in Irish, to a correspondent in Kilronan, Aran, county Galway, and to the fact that, although the letter reached Kilronan on a Tuesday, it was not delivered at the proper address until the following Saturday; and, if so, whether, seeing that Irish is the home language of the Aran Islands, he can state what steps will be taken to insure that such a delay shall not occur again.

---

† See (4) *Debates* cxli., 1332

Lord STANLEY: I have had inquiry made into the case to which the hon. Member refers. The delay in the delivery of the letter was caused by the fact that, although the officers employed in the Kilronan Post Office can speak Irish, they were unable to decipher the address, which is stated to have been incorrectly written and spelled. I am sorry for the inconvenience occasioned.

Mr. BOLAND: Was the postmaster at Kilronan not able to read Irish, as well as speak it?

Lord STANLEY: He was not able to read it, but he took every possible method he could to find out what was meant by the address.

Mr. BOLAND: Is it not a fact that the reason why the delay took place was that the postmaster could not read Irish?

Lord STANLEY: No, Sir; it was because the man who wrote the Irish did not, apparently, know how to do it properly.

Mr. BOLAND: May I ask who informed the noble Lord that the address was incorrectly written?

Lord STANLEY: Those in whom I have implicit confidence.

Dublin Postmen's Overtime.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the overtime earned by several postmen in the Dublin district on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve is not yet paid; what is the reason for the delay; and whether he will give instructions for its payment forthwith.

Lord STANLEY: The overtime claimed by some of the Dublin postmen for the Christmas and New Year season was so large as to necessitate special inquiry being made before the claims could be sanctioned. Payment was made on the 3rd instant, with the current week's wages, in accordance with instructions which were given on the 28th ultimo.

Mr. NANNETTI: Has not the money been paid since the Question was put down?

Lord STANLEY: I do not know. Instructions were given for it to be paid on the 28th ultimo, after proper inquiries had been made.

Auxiliaries in the Dublin Post Office.

Mr. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that several auxiliaries are employed in the Dublin Post Office at primary sorting for two hours each evening; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of employing the staff engaged as learners on this work; and will he say whether these auxiliaries passed any technical or other examination; what is the salary paid to them; and whether the salaries paid to the learners while waiting for appointment could be augmented by employing them to do this work; and will he explain why two messengers, a paper-keeper, and a boy copyist from the secretary's office are performing overtime at the same class of work.

Lord STANLEY: The employment of some auxiliary sorters at Dublin in the evening is necessary to provide for duties vacated by learners who are being employed as substitutes for sorting clerks and telegraphists. These minor duties cannot be assigned to other learners, as they are not then available. The auxiliaries, who are paid 4½d. an hour, are not required to pass any technical or educational examination before employment; nor is it necessary that they should do so, inasmuch as the work they perform is of a very simple character. The persons drawn from the secretary's office, to whom the hon. Member refers, are employed between 6.0 p.m. and 7.0 p.m., during which period no learners are available.

Mr. NANNETTI: Are not these learners receiving the magnificent wage of 6s. per week, and will the noble Lord see that they get overtime pay as well as the auxiliaries who receive 15s. weekly.

Lord STANLEY: I could not hear or understand the hon. Member's Question. Perhaps he will put it down.

MR. NANNETTI: I did not speak in Irish, anyway.

Irish National Teachers' Pension Fund.

MR. P. A. McHUGH: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether, in view of the discontent amongst the teachers of national schools in Ireland in connection with the present condition of the Teachers' Pension Fund and its administration, he will secure the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate the matters complained of.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): At the close of the present year the usual quinquennial investigation of the Teachers' Pension Fund will be instituted. Pending the result of that investigation I think that such an inquiry as the hon. Member suggests would be premature.

Irish National Teachers' Pensions.

MR. P. A. McHUGH: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that promotion on the pension establishment has been denied to Irish national teachers for the past five years owing to the abolition of classification and the introduction of grading; and, if so, whether he will make provision in the pension rules to meet the new arrangements.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: New rules are about to be enacted to meet the new arrangements referred to by the hon. Member.

Irish National Teachers' Pension Fund.

MR. P. A. McHUGH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Abstract of the Irish National Teachers' Pension Fund, which was presented in June last, has been printed as a Parliamentary Paper; and, if not, will he have it printed.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The Abstract referred to has not been printed, but in compliance with the hon. Member's desire I will cause it to be done.

The Government's Fiscal Policy.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government has determined at the ensuing general election to ask a mandate from the electorate to oppose any proposal to impose taxation which for purposes other than the raising of revenue tends to raise the price of wheat or flour to the consumer in this country.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not think that the contents of my election address are a proper subject for Question and Answer across the floor of the House.

MR. BLACK: Is it then the policy of the Government that Ministers should alternately advocate and condemn taxation of this character?

No Answer being given.

MR. BLACK, again rising, said: Has the right hon. Gentleman no Answer to give to my supplementary Question?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not even hear it.

MR. BLACK: May I repeat it, Sir?

*MR. SPEAKER: It does not arise out of the Answer of the right hon. Gentleman. The Question on the Paper was fully answered.

MR. BLACK: I beg to submit, Sir, that the Question was not answered.

*MR. SPEAKER: There seems to be some confusion in the minds of some hon. Members as to the difference between an Answer and a satisfactory Answer.

Training of Teachers in Scotland.

MR. BLACK: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of various points of general interest arising upon the Minute for the Training of Teachers in Scotland, whether he will afford an opportunity of discussing the terms of the Minute before it becomes operative.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot promise to give facilities for discussing this question, but an opportunity will arise either on the Scotch Education Bill or on the Estimates before the Minute comes into operation.

Imperial Defence Committee and the Defence of the United Kingdom.

Colonel WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Committee of Imperial Defence has arrived at the authoritative decision, on which it was engaged in July, 1903, as to the force which should be maintained for the defence of the United Kingdom; if so, what its numbers and composition should be, and the number of invaders it is calculated to repel.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Committee of Defence are clearly of opinion that invasion of these islands in such force as to inflict a fatal blow or threaten our independence is impossible. The governing consideration which, as it seems to us, ought to determine the number of troops to be maintained depends not so much on considerations affecting home defence as upon the claim which Colonial and, still more, Indian needs may make upon our military resources.

Opportunity for Discussion of Indian Affairs.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, considering the disappointment of the people of India at the lack of opportunities afforded for the discussion of their affairs in Parliament, he would give an early opportunity for a full debate on Indian affairs.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: A full debate on Indian affairs is a rather large order, as I suppose it would cover the whole question of the external and internal relations of India. I should be very glad for such a debate to take place, and, as the hon. Gentleman knows, there are methods by which private Members can obtain opportunities for such a discussion, but I cannot promise him exceptional opportunities.

Mr. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) asked whether the Prime Minister thought the interests of 300,000,000 of His Majesty's subjects in India were satisfied by one discussion at the end of the session on the Indian Budget. Why could not a further opportunity be given to the House?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not hostile to a discussion in this House on Indian affairs, but I could not admit it to be axiomatic or self-evident that the interests of 300,000,000 of His Majesty's subjects in India would be improved by a debate in this House.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I ask what the business is for to-morrow?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to ask my right hon. friend to bring in the Scottish Education Bill under the Ten Minutes Rule, and after that I shall proceed with the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: If the Education Bill is substantially the same one as last year there is nothing unreasonable in bringing it in under the Ten Minutes Rule, but if it is novel I hope that course will not be adopted.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I am justified in saying that it is substantially the same Bill as last session.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

Sir James Fergusson reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had appointed Sir James Fergusson to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure; and Mr. John Edward Ellis to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures.

Sir James Fergusson further reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had agreed to the following resolution: That any Member of the Chairmen's Panel be and he is hereby empowered to ask any other Member of the Chairmen's panel to take his place in case of necessity.

Reports to lie upon the Table

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Select Committee :

1. "That, in the case of the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway, Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the Liverpool Corporation Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to insert their additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

3. "That, in the case of the Malvern Water, Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for a Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to deposit their Petition for a Bill."

4. "That, in the case of the Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of the 'Donegal County Council,' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

5. "That, in the case of the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway, Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought not to be dispensed with."

First Four Resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection ; That they had nominated the following Members to serve on the Standing Committee for the consideration of all Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, which may, by Order of the House, be committed to such Standing Committee :—Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Baird, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Boland, Mr. Griffith Boscawen, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Cawley, Sir Charles Cayzer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir John Colomb, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Vaughan Davies, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Doogan, Sir J. Fortescue Flannery, Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Garfit, Sir Alfred Hickman, Sir William Holland, Mr. James F. Hope, Sir William Houldsworth, Sir James Joicey, Mr Lambert, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Grant Lawson, Sir Elliott Lees, Colonel Long, Mr. Charles McArthur, Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. William McKillop, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. O'Mara, Mr. Pike Pease, Colonel Pilkington, Sir James Rankin, Sir Charles Renshaw, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Round, Mr. Runciman, Mr. T. W. Russell, Sir Henry Seton-Karr, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Sir John Barrington Simeon, Sir Edward Strachey, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Theodore Taylor, Mr. Tennant, Mr. Whitley Thomson, Sir William Tomlinson, Mr. Tully, Sir William Walrond, Mr. George Whiteley, Mr. Osmond Williams, Colonel Williams, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Wolff, and Mr. Young.

Mr. WODEHOUSE further reported from the Committee ; That they had nominated the following Members to serve on the Standing Committee for the consideration of all Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure which may, by Order of the House, be committed to such Standing Committee :—The Lord Advocate, Mr. Agg-Gardner, Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Barran, Sir George Bartley, Mr. Boland, Mr. Butcher, Lord Hugh Cecil, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Coghill, Mr. Colston, Mr. Cripps, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Tatton Egerton, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Mr. Samuel Evans, Mr. George Faber, Sir George Fardell, Mr. Flynn, Sir Frederick Godson, Mr. Goulding, Mr. Henry David Greene. Mr. Haldane, Mr. Harwood, Mr. T. M. Healy, Sir James Heath, Mr. Helder, Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Henry Hobhouse, Mr. John Hutton, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Jordan, Sir Lees Knowles, Mr. William Frederick Lawrence, Sir Joseph Leese, Colonel Legge, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Loder, Mr. Loyd, Mr. Macdona, Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Middlemore, Mr. Milvain, Mr. William Moore, Mr. Arthur Morton, Captain Norton, Sir Francis Sharp Powell, Colonel Pryce-Jones, Sir Robert Reid, Mr. Remnant, Mr. Bryn Roberts, Mr. Samuel

Roberts, Mr. Parker Smith, Mr. Soames, Mr. Soares, Mr. Solicitor-General, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Ure, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Lawrence Waldron, Mr. Robert Wallace, and Sir James Woodhouse.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Fifteen Members to serve on the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure in respect of the Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill:—Mr. Bell, Major Evans-Gordon, Mr. Cameron, Mr. John Burns, Sir Ernest Flower, Mr. Hayes Fisher, Mr. Charles McArthur, Colonel Pilkington, Mr. Russell Rea, Mr. Reckitt, Mr. Runciman, Sir Harry Samuel, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Austin Taylor, and Mr. Charles Wilson.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Fifteen Members to serve on the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing) Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill:—Sir Frederick Banbury, Mr. Bell, Mr. Brigg, Mr. Cripps, Mr. Fellowes, Mr. Gardner, Sir Edward Grey, Mr. Hudson, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Mount, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Spear, Viscount Turnour, Mr. Warner, and Mr. George White.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Fifteen Members to serve on the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, in respect of the Public Trustee and Executor Bill:—Mr. Black, Mr. Fison, Mr. Philip Foster, Mr. Beckett, Sir J. Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Corrie Grant, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Helme, Mr. Howard, Sir Henry Kimber, Sir Henry Seymour King, Mr. Layland-Barratt, Mr. Platt-Higgins, Mr. Thomas Richards, and Colonel Tufnell.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TRANSFER OF POWERS) BILL.

"To transfer to the Local Government Board the powers of the Treasury under enactments relating to Local Authorities," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; supported by Mr. Grant Lawson; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 21st March, and to be printed. [Bill 81.]

TIED HOUSES BILL.

"To abolish Tied Houses," presented by Mr. Broadhurst; supported by Sir John Brunner, Mr. Thomas Bayley, Mr. Herbert Lewis, and Mr. Levy; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 82.]

SHOP CLUBS BILL.

"To amend The Shop Clubs Act, 1902," presented by Mr. Broadhurst; supported by Sir John Brunner and Mr. Bell; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 83.]

SUPPLY (NAVY ESTIMATES).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question [6th March], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for Committee on Navy Estimates)."—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)

Question again proposed.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.), continuing his speech of the preceding night, said he desired to bring under the notice of the House a matter which, in his opinion, was one of the most serious that could possibly be raised, and, so far as he was aware, one which had never yet been brought before that Assembly. It had only to be stated in order to evoke from every true-hearted and true-minded person in England a storm of reprobation. They had believed during the last twenty-five years that flogging had been abolished both in the Army and the Navy, and it would be news to many people that to-day it was in active exercise in the Navy, and he would prove before he sat down that the Admiralty had done their very best to conceal that fact.

In the early part of that day he put a Question to the Secretary to the Admiralty in regard to important omissions in the invitations to our youth to join the Navy. Those invitations sketched out in bright language prospects of pay and treatment and the joys of a sailor's life, but they failed to make it clear that sailors were subject to the cat-o'-nine-tails, and that the youths and boys of the Royal Navy were liable to have inflicted upon them twenty-four strokes of the birch for trifling offences without being first tried by Court-martial. Clearly the Admiralty did not intend that a man should know what was before him when he was entering the service. He intended to avail himself of that opportunity—the first one he had had—to give to the public through the House of Commons particulars of what was going on every day in the King's ships, and he could tell them that he had in his possession hundreds of documents on which he based his allegations. Did the rules of the House permit, he would have moved a Resolution to the effect that the House regretted that, while the punishment of flogging had been abolished with the best results in His Majesty's Army for twenty-five years, men in the Navy were liable, under the provisions of the Naval Discipline Act, to receive a flogging consisting of twenty-five strokes of the cat-o'-nine-tails, which was a necessary equipment of every one of His Majesty's ships, while the boys and youths in the Navy under eighteen years of age were also by the naval regulations not merely tried by Court-martial for trivial offences, but were summarily liable to floggings over the bare breech of twenty-four lashes with birches nine ounces in weight and steeped in brine, or to twelve strokes with a cane, such birchings and canings to be inflicted by the ship's police in accordance with naval regulations and in the presence of all the boys on board the ship. He asserted that that sort of thing was going on in the Navy every day and that this flogging was even worse than the flogging which went on in the Chinese compounds of the Colonial Secretary. That might be considered to be a strong observation, but he put a question to the Colonial Secretary on the previous day, and he had the advantage of a clear answer in writing describing what went on in regard to the flogging of refractory Chinese indentured labourers in the Transvaal mines. That answer was to the following effect—

> "There are no cat-o'-nine-tails. The maximum of strokes inflicted with a cane, which is the instrument of whipping, would be twenty-four. The whipping would be given in the presence of the governor or deputy-governor of the prison, and the gaoler, and the visiting medical officer, who certifies to the fitness of the prisoner to undergo the punishment. The sentence being by a magistrate cannot be carried out till the record has been sent to and confirmed by a Judge of the High Court."

How different to what was going on in the King's Navy!

He would like to point out the folly and absurdity of the present state of affairs. The two Gentlemen who now represented the Admiralty in that House were both formerly officers of the King's Army—both distinguished officers, and could it be believed that they were bound to sanction the use of the lash in the Navy when it had been abolished in the Army for over twenty-five years? He must put it still more strongly. On March 11th, 1893, the present Secretary for India, who was then Secretary for War, said on the floor of the House of Commons that a colonel of the Grenadiers, an excellent officer, had been placed on half-pay because there had been the caning of a drummer boy in his regiment, for although he knew nothing about the occurrence at the time, it was considered there must have been an absence of discipline on his part. Yet at sea canings and floggings on board His Majesty's ships could be inflicted for the most trivial causes. With reference to Irish boys in the Navy his attention was directed to their case by a circular issued by the Catholic Hierarchy in Ireland asking parents and guardians of Irish boys not to allow the boys to go into the Navy because they were denied the ministrations of their faith. He thought there was an additional reason which might be advanced for not allowing them to enter the Navy, and that was that, while they were denied the spiritual ministrations of their faith, their bodies were subjected to atrocious and abominable outrages. Was that language exaggerated? He thought it would not be suggested that it was. On July 4th last in answer to a question the Secretary to the Admiralty distinctly denied that flogging existed in the Navy, but he minimised the effect of his answer by explaining that it had been suspended, but not abolished. He saw a letter some time ago addressed to Lord Selborne in which the writer asked leave to be permitted to take photographs of boys being flogged, and immediately afterwards placards were placed all round the dockyard threatening with instant dismissal anyone who gave information to strangers. That showed that the Admiralty were of opinion that it would be indecent to expose what was going on, although they did not think it indecent or atrocious to allow it to be done.

He recently received an answer from the Civil Lord of the Admiralty (the "Terror of Germany") to the effect that there was no flogging at all in the Navy. The present Prime Minister also made a statement to the same effect, but then there was nothing but inaccuracy to be expected from the right hon. Gentleman. When the question was pressed the Civil Lord stated that boys under eighteen years of age were not subjected to the punishment of flogging, but that they might be punished by birching or caning under regulations which prescribed in whose presence such punishment was to be inflicted, together with the maximum number of stripes and the character of the instrument to be used. He had looked up the regulations dealing with this matter, and he had found that the birching was to be confined solely to boys rated as such, and to be inflicted with the birch supplied by the dockyards, that the punishment was to be inflicted over the bare breech, that it was never to exceed twenty-four strokes, and that it was to be inflicted by the ship's police in the presence of the medical officer and others. He had looked up the regulations to see for what kind of offences that punishment could be inflicted and he found them most trivial. He had asked the Civil Lord of the Admiralty to make some alteration of the horrible regulation compelling boys to witness these floggings, but the hon. Gentleman declined to do so. What had since happened? Only last December there was a Court-martial on board the "Victory." He visited the vessel in that month, and was prevented from going into Nelson's cabin by the mere fact that a Court-martial was being held. But he was present at the close, and saw the prisoner emerge, and he never witnessed such a look of agony and despair on a boy's face as on that occasion. What were the circumstances under which that boy was tried? He had been compelled with a crowd of other boys to be present on one of the cruisers at the flogging of one of his companions, and he had been so overwhelmed by what he saw that he attacked the officer inflicting the punishment and almost knocked him down. Of course his offence was a very shocking one, but it was possible to sympathise with the feelings of the lad under such circumstances. He, of course, was also put upon his trial and was sentenced to a long term of hard labour, and to receive in addition twenty-four lashes. It was actions such as that which tended to produce rebellion in the Navy. It simply drove men to madness. There was another Court-martial at Devonport to which he would like to draw attention. In that case the boy had committed the very atrocious offence of stealing a few pence and had deserted his ship. For that he was very properly dismissed the Navy, but more was done. The full maximum flogging of twenty-four strokes with the birch was ordered to be inflicted, and he ventured to assert that that was both unconstitutional and illegal, for the lad having been dismissed the service there could have been no right to flog him in addition.

There was one special fact which struck him in connection with this matter, and that was that it was the children of the poor who were subjected to these indignities. The naval cadets and midshipmen in the service were not flogged, the flogging was reserved for the sons of the poor who had to pay the piper. He hoped that these facts would become known wherever the English working men had a vote. He had been furnished with a vast amount of information upon the subject, but he was not going to take up the time of the House by communicating it. Amongst his informants was an Anglican clergyman whose tender heart revolted at what he had heard, and who told him that the greatest apprehension prevailed among the parents of the children on board the training ships. Even for not being able to swim birching and caning was inflicted. He put a question to the Secretary to the Admiralty on that point, and his reply was that it was better to teach a boy to swim by flogging than to allow him to drown without flogging. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that an answer of that kind—a nice, pithy, little, after-dinner society joke—did more to accentuate the feeling against this horrible system than the finest speeches one could make, either before or after dinner. A short time ago an article was published by Mr. Tighe Hopkins, who declared that flogging and anything which tended to degrade the person was shocking, and that there should be complete statistics furnished in regard to it, but he was sorry to say that there were no statistics as to the canings in the Navy. He had asked for them several times, but he had never been able to get them. He had been told that to obtain them for the last three years would be too expensive. Yes, it would be too expensive in the votes which the Secretary to the Admiralty and his Party would lose if the system were made public. He had, however, obtained a Return—a very poor, meagre, stingy Return—which would meet his purpose to some extent. It was a Return for the year 1901–2, and it stated that in that period there were 238 birchings by summary conviction—by the nod of the captain's head—and only three by Court-martial, while there were something like 12,000 minor offences among the boys, and for those minor offences at least 8,000 canings were inflicted. The Return for last year showed a slight decrease in the figures, there having been 250 birchings and about 8,000 canings. He felt it incumbent upon him to do what he could to put a stop to this. The weight of the birch used upon these poor boys was twice as heavy as that used in civil life, by order of the magistrate and the Judge, for the punishment of boys guilty of the most atrocious crimes and offences. The cane used weighed 2 oz., was 3 feet long, and was laced round with waxed twine like the handle of a cricket bat. When the Fleet under the command of Lord Charles Beresford came into Dublin Bay he pretty well knew what was going on, and he wrote to the people of Ireland through the *Freeman's Journal*, and pointed out the dark and sinister designs of these ships upon the youths of Ireland, and warned the parents not to let their sons join the Navy.

These were the things produced by this system, and not efficiency, and the Government ought to know, having tried it everywhere else and failed, that force was no remedy, and that it had not survived in the Army and could not survive in the Navy. After the various things that had been said upon this subject, which led to parents and guardians being chary of allowing their boys to enlist in the Navy, a most outrageous placard was published by the Admiralty, under the King's Cypher, and sent to every post office in Ireland, to the effect that youths between seventeen and eighteen could now join the Navy without their parents' consent.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) explained that that notice was issued without authority, but that when it came to the knowledge of the Admiralty it was at once withdrawn.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said no doubt that might be so, but how many boys were allowed to enlist before this notice came to the knowledge of the Admiralty. The Civil Lord had stated that there was no flogging in the Navy at all. The hon. Gentleman, no doubt to encourage young ambition, went down to the Royal Naval School at Greenwich and told the lads there that, just as it was said of the soldiers of Napoleon that every soldier carried a marshal's baton in his knapsack, so it was true of the Navy to say that everybody who joined it had a chance of a baton. Yes, the birch and the cane. He did not desire to bring this matter to a vote, but he would bring it up again and again, and would appeal to the Press of England to have this matter properly ventilated. The hon. Member also read a letter from a clergyman who had spent many years in the service, describing the manner in which the flogging was conducted, and giving a particular instance when the deck was more like a slaughter-house than anything else, and the victim died a few days afterwards. He said he had other cases of a revolting character with which he would not trouble the House, as he thought he had said enough to stimulate a spirit of inquiry and investigation in every honourable and true-hearted man. He appealed to hon. Members to put themselves in the place of these defenceless boys, and to allow the strong arm of England to protect them. Flogging had been abolished in every Navy except our own, but the worst feature was that it was a punishment inflicted by the rich upon the poor. He had stated the facts as fairly and as temperately as possible, and he thought he had made out a strong case for a thorough investigation into the system. There could be no higher honour for the new First Lord than that he should initiate his *régime* by instituting a searching investigation into this matter. He had confined himself largely to letters and questions, because the Secretary to the Admiralty, having exhausted his right to speak, would be precluded from making any reply. But why was there not present some other member of the Government who was or had been connected with the Admiralty. This atrocious system demanded some defence or explanation, as it was not right that such charges, made in good faith, should go broadcast to the country. If they were true, what was the House of Commons thinking about that it did not abolish the system when it abolished flogging in the Army? He had brought the question forward not merely in the interests of Irish boys, but in the interests of humanity, feeling strongly that such cruelties ought not to be inflicted on the young of the poor and defenceless.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): said that while there was no flogging properly so-called in the Navy, there was a caning and birching restricted to boys, but it was not the fact that that punishment was reserved for the children of the poor. In the gun-room, the home of the midshipmen, flogging of a much more severe character was practised, not with a birch or cane, but with a dirk-scabbard. This flogging was practised by the so-called rich themselves on themselves and never yet had a boy been heard to complain, but on the contrary many had declared that to the discipline of the gun-room they owed a great deal of their success in the service. ["Oh."] He had two sons in the Navy who had passed through the gun-room, and if they were not scabbarded themselves, they had doubtless scabbarded others. But he did regret that this punishment still existed, even for boys, in the Navy, as he thought it could be dispensed with. It could not be denied, however, that boys required a lot of keeping in order, and he would like to have known the offences for which some of the birchings were given, as possibly they would have revolted the House as much as the birchings themselves. At the same time he deeply regretted that there should be retained in an honourable and noble service even the semblance of personal violence, and, as he had said on former occasions, he earnestly hoped that some means would be found of putting an end to it for ever.

Turning to the Main question, he submitted that the discussion with Mr. Speaker in the Chair ought properly to be concerned with matters of high policy, such as strategy, the principles of naval construction, lesser matters being reserved for the particular Votes under which they naturally arose. More especially ought that to be the case in a year marked by a change of policy such as the oldest Member of the House could not remember in the history of the Navy. Any eulogy of the Board of Admiralty on his part had been rendered unnecessary by the Secretary to the Admiralty, who, although a member of that Board, had with unwonted readiness, generosity, and modesty bestowed that eulogy himself, and nothing he could add would increase its force or aptitude. His absence from the House during the speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty was due not to any want of respect to the hon. Gentleman, but partly to other occupations, and partly because the supreme authority over the Navy had been short-circuited. That authority now belonged neither to the Secretary to the Admiralty nor even to the First Lord, but to the First Sea Lord. It was the First Sea Lord who appeared in the new policy and throughout the Memoranda in which that policy was described, and, therefore, less importance attached to the highly interesting speeches of the Secretary to the Admiralty. At the present moment the Board of Admiralty was in a strange situation, there being, in fact, an interregnum. There was no First Lord really responsible for the Memoranda which had been put forward. It was true that Lord Cawdor had been brought from the Great Western Railway to take command of the Navy, but he was not responsible for any of the Memoranda, nor was it known even whether he approved of them. The noble Earl should make a good First Lord, as he had the reputation of a man of business, which reputation it was to be hoped he would justify in his new sphere. But, at any rate, Lord Cawdor was not responsible for these Memoranda. The First Lord who was responsible had gone to South Africa to take up a higher position. He was fortunate in many respects, but in none so fortunate as in the acquisition of Sir John Fisher at the Admiralty. For Sir John Fisher had overruled the whole of his policy, and substituted for it a completely contrary policy. He wished to know the conditions under which Sir John Fisher had been brought to the Admiralty. Was he a colleague? Was he a superior? Was this another MacDonnell case? He strongly suspected that, more astute, or more fortunate, than the late Chief Secretary for Ireland, Lord Selborne had flown to South Africa to escape the beneficent tyranny of Sir John Fisher, instead of resigning, as the Chief Secretary for Ireland had thought it honourable to do, to escape being overruled by his subordinate. He had not a word to say against Sir John Fisher; on the contrary, he approved of his policy, although there were some matters in regard to which he should like some explanation. He believed that what was being done upon his advice was of the soundest and the most profitable description and would have the best possible results.

The changes set forth in the two Memoranda before them were not only new, but they formed a different policy contrary to the old. They included new principles in strategy, naval bases, and ships, gunnery, and even a new organisation of the Board of Admiralty itself; in fact, the whole system, from the First Lord to the Admiral's barge, had been completely up-ended. He was about to ask for an explanation which he should have been glad if some member of the Council of Defence had been present to afford—for these matters belonged at last to them—but not one of them was present. There had been tremendous alterations in the organisation of the Admiralty. The Senior Naval Lord was now to be called the First Sea Lord, and everything concerned with "important naval policy" was to be left to him. That meant a supersession of the First Lord of the Admiralty by the First Sea Lord—as to which he would only say that if it produced such beneficial results as the supersession of Lord Selborne by Sir John Fisher, long might it continue. With regard to gunnery he noticed that there was to be an inspector of target practice who would "not be an Admiralty officer," but who would work under the superintendence of First Sea Lord. Was this officer under no subordination? Did he owe obedience or respect to nobody? Why was such an officer not to be placed under the Board? Was this yet another MacDonnell? He was aware that the personality of Admiral Percy Scott would justify his appointment under special conditions, for he had made the gunnery of the Navy, and had done it in opposition to and in spite of the present Board of Admiralty. He knew that Admiral Percy Scott had experienced the very greatest difficulty in getting the smallest advances made towards his system of quick-hitting gunnery. After constant refusals there had at last been a tardy recognition of the true principle that, not the gunnery lieutenant alone, but the captain and the admiral were responsible for the gunnery of the squadron. That was an enormous step in advance. It was almost impossible for any Member of the House not acquainted with gunnery to appreciate the enormous advantage to the future of gunnery achieved by this change. Nevertheless there remained much to be done, for a great many ships still had defective sights and sighting machinery, and nobody knew that better than the Secretary to the Admiralty. He hoped and believed that Admiral Percy Scott's system would make their gunners the best quick-hitters of any navy in the world. But what position did Admiral Percy Scott hold? Were the Admiralty bound to listen to him? If there was any uncertainty about this it might lead to another resignation of a Minister.

There was a further change in the rank and file of the Navy itself which he should like to suggest. There was a disposition and a determination on the part of the Board of Admiralty to neglect and put aside the ordinary Naval Reserve, which consisted for the most part of fishermen and Marines who formed the best material in the world for the Navy. This Reserve appeared to be set aside for the Naval Volunteers, who were a perfectly useless set of people who liked to wear uniform, the money spent upon whom was absolutely thrown away. What he complained of was that while they were developing this popinjay naval stuff they were neglecting the proper material in the Naval Reserve. They were extending the Naval Volunteer system which cost so much instead of the Naval Reserve which cost less, and they were stopping recruiting for those Reserves. That was unfortunate considering the great value of this body of men. We had 121,000 Naval seamen, costing each, in wages, victualling, clothing and doctoring, some £82 per man yearly, whereas the 34,000 Naval Reserve men only cost £7 or £8 per man. In modern ships the trained Reserve man was as good as the Naval seaman, in boats he was usually far better, and the true system was to increase the numbers of the £8 man and by so much to diminish the numbers of the £82 man. By reducing 10,000 Naval seaman at the higher rate and adding 40,000 Reserve men at the lower, you would get 30,000 more men at £500,000 less cost. Yet the Admiralty had stopped recruiting for the Reserves! He now came to the change of policy as to ships. He did not know whether the House realised the extent of the changes made. The First Lord of the Admiralty confessed in his first Memorandum of December last that for the last fifteen years the Board of Admiralty had never had men enough to keep the Fleet Reserve in proper condition. Yet, in the same breath he acknowledged that Parliament had always freely granted him all the men he asked for. What a discreditable confession! This Memorandum went on to say that the increased number of ships in commission had more than swallowed up the increase in the *personnel*, and consequently adequate provision for the ships in the Fleet Reserve had not yet been made. It practically avowed that in consequence of their want of *personnel* the ships in the Fleet Reserve could not be trusted to fight nor to inspire confidence in any admiral.

He now came to the other ships—what he might call the general run of the Fleet. What were they told about them? They were told that there were a number of obsolete ships, 130 or 160, which were to be removed from the Navy List in order that the country might have ships that were really ready for war. But why did the Admiralty not adopt that policy years ago? Why had this new and perfectly proper principle of having the Fleet composed only of vessels competent for naval purposes occurred now for the first time to the Board of Admiralty? When he was in Malta in 1890, or thereabout, the Admiralty were engaged in fishing up from the bottom of the sea, the *Sultan*, a ship which ought to have been thrown on the scrap heap years ago. That ship, in fact, ought never to have been fished up from the bottom of the sea in the expensive manner employed. She was, however, now tardily to be removed from our deceptive list and other obsolete ships with her. This was what he would call the scrap-heap policy. It was quite right. His complaint was that the House had been asked for, and year after year had given, money for these useless ships. The Admiralty had adopted the idea that because they had a number of bows and arrows in the Admiralty office they were justified in keeping them as possibly useful somehow, someday, instead of devoting themselves to the torpedo tube. There had been one delightful ingenuous avowal put as a defence. The Prime Minister, speaking recently at Glasgow, said—

> "What has this Government been doing?' They have abolished 130 vessels—my figures are not exact, I speak from memory—130 vessels which figured upon the list of the British Navy. [A VOICE: "Good riddance of bad rubbish."]

That brief interruption puts even more concisely and pithily than I can do, one of the aspects, but only one of the aspects, of the great reform. It is not merely that the Board of Admiralty have laid down the rule that a ship, however useful in time of peace—and we have to do, it must be admitted, a great deal of small police work in a time of peace for diplomatic or other purposes—is not only useless, but worse than useless in time of war if it possesses neither fighting power nor speed; it is merely a ship which exists to embarrass British admirals and to discredit the British flag."

The Board of Admiralty after having ignored and by its conduct denied it for years, suddenly discovered this important principle, but it required Sir John Fisher to help them to discover it. In the same speech the Prime Minister said—

"Well, with one courageous stroke of the pen, as it were, these ships have been removed."

One courageous stroke of the pen! He liked to hear that this Government was sometimes courageous. He thought that when they found courage to force one of their colleagues to break his pledge they derived it not so much from themselves as from the power behind the Cabinet, and that it was in spite of themselves that the heel of Birmingham was crushed upon them. But we were assured they found the courage to abolish a number of obsolete ships in the Navy. No. It was not the Government that abolished the ships, it was Sir John Fisher who abolished them. During all the ten years that these great Lords of the Admiralty had flourished at the head of the Navy the ships were allowed to go on. Ships had been fished up from the deep, and old ships incapable of fighting had been kept on the list. Now it had been discovered that the true policy was only to keep in the Navy ships which were fit for service. The new policy was a full confession of the badness of the old policy so long pursued, so costly, so dangerous.

He came now to the question of naval bases. A great change and reversal of policy had taken place there. He need not remind the House that a naval base was important as indicating what our strategy was. The naval bases suggested or disclosed to every strategic mind the events which were expected to occur in war, the places where they expected great actions, and the refuges where they expected the ships to go for repair. Therefore the retention or abandonment of a naval base was in itself a disclosure of strategy. What was the disclosure here. He need not remind the House that this Government had always been tinkering at naval bases. They took Wei-hai-Wei as a base for meeting Russia and it had been kept as a sort of Chinese Margate. They were retaining it now to see which way the cat jumps. Then there was Gibraltar, where £5,000,000 had been spent in order to make it less secure and more tempting to an enemy. Finally there was the great base of Rosyth, bought at a cost of £122,000. If his memory did not play him false the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty told us that we should have to incur considerable expenditure in order to make it the important naval base contemplated. The Peer who received a great deal more than the value of that land had been dismissed with the purchase price. What was to have been a great naval base at Rosyth was now, it seemed, to be a place to keep a few stores. It was difficult to imagine the confusion of mind that seemed to exist in the Board of Admiralty with regard to naval bases, taken up lightly and expensively, then as lightly abandoned, even before they were completed. But there was something even more startling. Halifax, Esquimalt, Jamaica, and Trincomalee were, as it seemed, practically to be abandoned. The last-named place was a most important station, and if ever we had another fight about India it would be as important that we should have it as it was found to be in the last century. It was a very serious matter to abandon it. It might be said that we had Colombo instead, but that would never be the same thing. All these were great questions in regard to which the House had no proper explanation and as to which they were entitled to an explanation. Jamaica, always a most commanding strategic base, was becoming more important as a naval strategic point than ever before on account of the impending Panama canal. The abandonment of it would, it appeared to him, be an acknowledgment that we meant no longer to defend our West Indian Islands with our naval force. If that were so, a serious question would arise as to whether the Government were justified in signing the Sugar Convention. How was it that all these abandonments had now been discovered to be possible, and never before? Was it all due to Sir John Fisher? Was there nobody at the Admiralty who could invent or imagine anything before? It looked like it. The Secretary to the Admiralty had rightly said that the great thing in regard to the Navy was "continuity of policy." But this was discontinuity of policy. All those things he had mentioned, and others he was about to mention, represented not a continuance of the same policy, but an entire change. He did not say that it could not be justified, but it had not been justified yet. The reasons for it had not yet been suggested. It was absurd to talk of continuity of policy in the face of revolutions like these.

He observed with considerable apprehension that part of the new policy was to leave the Atlantic Fleet, consisting of eight iron-clads and a corresponding number of cruisers—which was the most important Fleet we had, to entirely rely for its repairs on Gibraltar. He did not think that was very safe. Gibraltar, let it be remembered, produced nothing. Every pound of steel and every pound of coal or biscuit that Gibraltar used or supplied to the ships of war had to be sent across from this country, and in time of war, if we forced our most important Fleet to rely on Gibraltar for supplies and repairs, that meant that it would be necessary to set up a new line of communications between these islands and Gibraltar to carry the stores and the repairing materials, and it would be a very difficult and dangerous line of communication to guard. He presumed that was present to the mind of those who had agreed to adopt the new policy. Here again he should like some explanation. Take the alterations all these matters involved in the conception of naval strategy. It was something almost incredible that this country should give up the naval base in the West Indies. That meant a kind of thing that would have appeared to the men of Nelson's day or of Lord St. Vincent's as impossible to conceive of, and still more impossible to be adopted by a naval country like this. It meant an enormous alteration in the conception of what this country would have to do in a great war. They were going entirely to abolish the South Pacific Squadron. Were there no British interests in the South Pacific? The abandonment of Esquimalt almost seemed to him to be an abandonment of the small squadron in the North Pacific. Was that intended? Were they going practically to abolish the North Atlantic Squadron, as a squadron? If so, they were going to abolish their naval watch and ward on both sides of the great continent of North America. He did not say it was wrong, but what justification had they for it? Had they an understanding with the United States? Was Canada going to build a navy? What was the new element that enabled the Government to detach this country from those parts of the world which formerly we held so strongly navally? What induced them to give up those naval bases in this manner? This was the stage at which the House should be told. He had endeavoured in a summary manner to follow some of the points that were suggested by this Naval Memorandum. It raised some vital questions of high policy and strategy. He trusted the Government had good answers to the very serious questions he had raised. On many of them he was perfectly convinced the new policy was right; on others he had very serious doubts. He trusted that before the debate ended he might receive satisfaction of these doubts from the Government, which would enable him to feel greater confidence in the plan than he did at present.

*Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said that the House must feel indebted to the hon. Member for Donegal for having brought forward the question of punishment in the Navy. In view of the prominent part which hon. Members for Ireland took in securing the abolition of flogging in the Army twenty-six years ago, it was only fitting that attention should be drawn to the existence of corporal punishment in the Navy from the same quarter of the House. He thought that the general question which must arise in the mind of hon. Members was "Can these things be true?" And the conclusion must be that, if they were true, as the hon. and learned Member undoubtedly believed them to be, or even only half true, they constituted a great scandal which ought to be removed at the earliest possible moment. They knew only too well what an invincible prejudice surrounded the question of the abolition of corporal punishment in the minds of some people, and how hard it was to kill that prejudice. For over a century, whenever even a mitigation of that revolting punishment was suggested, its advocates, one after the other, held that discipline could not be maintained without it, and that to do away with it would be to undermine the whole basis on which the military and naval service rested. He had in his possession the order book of a regiment in the Waterloo Campaign in which it was recorded that a Court-martial had been held on an unfortunate soldier for a not very serious offence, and the result of which was that the soldier was condemned to the punishment of a thousand lashes. That punishment in the Army died very hard, and was only eliminated late in the nineteenth century. The statements made by the hon. and learned Member for Donegal must, he thought, have come to hon. Members and to the general public with a shock of surprise. The general impression was that flogging had been abolished, at all events in the services, though it lingered unfortunately in the military and civil prisons—a practice which many hon. Members were most anxious to see abolished. It was almost universally believed that any one taking service in the Army or Navy would not be liable to the brutal and degrading punishment of flogging. It was perfectly true that its existence must discourage enlisting. They were told that the Army would suffer greatly by its abolition, but exactly the contrary had been the result. There had been an infinitely better class of recruits, and the *status* of the soldier had been much improved. To his mind the inability to keep discipline or order either on shipboard, in a regiment, or in a prison was simply a confession of incompetence of those in command. He hoped that in the course of the debate in Committee they should have some satisfactory assurance from the Under-Secretary that in a very short time corporal punishment in the Navy would be entirely abolished.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) congratulated his hon. and learned friend, the Member for Donegal on raising this question of flogging in the Navy. His hon. and learned friend by doing so had performed a public service. When the people of this country heard of the brutality that existed in the Navy they would take the matter into their own hands and do something to abolish it. The naval authorities might say that it was necessary to keep that degrading flogging in order to maintain discipline, but his hon. and learned friend had shown that in the French, German, and other navies the system had been abolished; and he wanted to know what there was in the British youth which was worse than in those of other countries which made this system necessary. He ventured to say that future generations would wonder why this brutal punishment had been continued so long. His hon. friend the Member for Crewe was right in saying that it was fit that the subject should have been pressed from those benches. He was glad to say that the Party with which he was identified had brought about the great reform in the Army of the abolition of a punishment which was degrading to those who suffered it, to those who inflicted it, and to those who witnessed it. The soldiery of England had to thank, in great measure, a body of Members from Ireland who had always stood up for the rights of the people, for the abolition of flogging in the Army. He remembered that when the late Mr. Parnell was making a tour through Ireland soldiers approached him and asked to be allowed to shake hands with the man who had "killed the Cat."

As to the reductions in the Navy Estimates he wanted to know what benefit that would be to his country. He remembered the time when the cost of the Navy was only £15,000,000, and the Navy seemed just as efficient then as now. Ireland had no commerce to protect. England took very good care of that, because she had crushed their native industries. To his mind the people who should largely contribute to the naval Votes of this country were the Colonies for whom we kept the sea open and who had a large trade to protect.

Canada refused, and though other colonies gave a small contribution, it was far more their duty to contribute to naval expenditure than that of Ireland, who, nevertheless, had to contribute an eleventh of the whole. Then look at the matter in another way. The naval expenditure percolated through the whole community in this country; because the Votes were mostly spent on the Thames, the Tyne, the Clyde, and at Pembroke. The only expenditure in Ireland was at Haulbowline, but that was a small, tinkering amount. They had asked the Admiralty for £100 to assist in making a pier which would be of the greatest advantage to the Admiralty themselves; but they could not see their way to incur that small outlay. Ireland derived some small advantage under the Army Votes; but derived literally no value under the Navy Votes; yet Ireland was called upon to pay more than her proper proportion. This, he assumed, was one of the benefits resulting from the Union. When the details of the Votes were before the House, his colleagues and himself might be compelled to take what the late Mr. Biggar would call an intelligent interest in them; and would be able to show that while Ireland contributed an enormous sum to the Navy she derived no benefit from it. He hoped the speech of his hon. friend would draw the attention of the public to the gross cruelty which still existed in the public service. In that case his hon. friend would deserve the thanks of the country and of humanity.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said that several of the old vessels referred to by the Secretary to the Admiralty had been anchored in the Clyde; and he wished to impress on the House the large amount of inconvenience and annoyance they caused. Many hon. Members knew that the Kyles of Bute were not only fishing grounds, but were also used by yachtsmen. The result was that not only was the fishing industry injured, but much inconvenience was caused to yachtsmen. The hon. Gentleman had received a very strongly worded memorial from all the yacht clubs in the Clyde on the subject. The House was aware that those waters were the most favourite yachting waters in the United Kingdom; and the memorial mentioned several other parts where the ships could be equally well anchored. He quite understood that the Admiralty wanted to have those vessels within easy reach of suitable yards; but he wished to direct attention to alternative anchorages, such as Gareloch portion of Loch Fyne and Loch Long. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman if he were prepared to send a proper official from the Admiralty to report on those alternative anchorages, so that, if possible, the ships might be moved from places where they caused so much inconvenience to navigation and trade to anchorages equally convenient to the Admiralty. He would also ask that a copy of the Report should be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire) said that one sentence fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn which interested him somewhat. The right hon. Gentleman asked whether it was a fact that the Government had abandoned altogether their ambitious plan at Rosyth. If so, the Government would appear to be repeating the blunder they committed at Wei-hai-Wei. That was supposed to be a great naval base which would checkmate Russia at Port Arthur; but, after considerable sums of money had been spent on it, it was suddenly announced it was no good except as a sanatorium. With regard to Rosyth, two years ago the scheme was triumphantly brandished in the eye of Germany as a kind of threat when the German frenzy was at its height. As far as could be gathered from Lord Selborne's reply to the Member for East Aberdeenshire, he did not altogether deny that the scheme was abandoned, but, at the same time, he did not admit it, and took refuge in the assertion that the whole business had been very cheaply done. It was not a question as to whether it was cheaply done or not, but why it was done at all. It seemed to be a gross blunder; and it was no argument to say that it was only a small one. It was small blunders like Wei-hai-Wei, Somaliland, and Rosyth, together with administrative incompetence, which had, during the last nine years, increased the taxation of this country.

Mr. PRETYMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the House should have an opportunity of saying whether it desires to continue this debate with me in the Chair or in Committee. I will, therefore, put the Motion.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 249; Noes, 198. (Division List, No. 26.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H F (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.)
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Ed. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (Lond'nd'ry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Staffords. N. W
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H. C (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn J. Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C E H. (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wylie, Alexander

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Cap. E C (S. Andrw's Bgbs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, N E
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby
Jones, William (Carnarvonshr.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters (N Dorset
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes — Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Spencer.

Question put accordingly, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

The House divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 199. (Division List No. 27.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middle'x
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A (Glasgow)
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs).
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshr.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Ed. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar, Sir T R (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin&Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Staffords NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H. (Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W
Kerr, John

Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph (Monm’th
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (YorksNR
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Fredrk. N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H(Dumfriesshr.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner,Rt. Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. LionelWalter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir Harry S(Limehouse
Scott, Sir S.(Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,H.C(North’mb Tyneside
Smith,RtHnJ.Parker (Lanarks

Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley,Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J G (Oxf’dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H. (Sheffi’d
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir WilliamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.,Col. ACE. (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H. (Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams,Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, T. Gibson (King’sLynn
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell James
Cameron, Robert

Campbell, John (Armagh, S)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Cap.EC(SAndrw’sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)

Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir FrancisH(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander(Lanark,NE
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George

Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H.(Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt.Hn. John (Montrose
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P.J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters(NDorset
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse,SirJT. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 129,000 officers, seamen, and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1906, including 20,211 Royal Marines."—Motion by leave, withdrawn.

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1904–5 (SOMALILAND).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £550,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Additional Expenditure in respect of the following Army Services, viz. :—

		£
Vote 1.	Pay, etc., of the Army -	985,000
,, 2.	Medical Establishments, Pay, etc. - - -	21,000
,, 6.	Transport and Remounts - - -	265,000
,, 7.	Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies - -	260,000
,, 12.	Miscellaneous Effective Services - - -	2,000
,, 14.	Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other non-effective charges for Officers, etc. - -	1,000

Vote 15. Pensions and other non-effective charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men and others	2,000
	1,536,000
Less Surpluses on other Votes -	386,000
	1,150,000
Deduct Excess Appropriations-in-Aid - - -	600,000
	£550,000

*SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall) said he did not complain of any increase in the Reserve, but he thought the present would be a good opportunity for the Secretary of State to allay in some degree the apprehensions entertained in many quarters with regard to the maintenance of the Reserve. The Reserve added so greatly to the fighting strength of the Army in the late war that Lord Lansdowne stated that the system introduced by Lord Cardwell had enabled this country to put into the field a larger and more efficient force than had ever left these shores before. There was also the economic fact that the Reservist cost only £9 per annum as against the £50 of the man with the colours. That being so, the War Office could not do better than have as small a force with the colours as was consistent with the safety of the country, and as large a Reserve as they could get. But the right hon. Gentleman had found it necessary to alter the mode of recruiting with the result that we were not getting the short-service men by whom the Reserve would be increased, but were limited to the nine-years men, who, after spending almost the whole of their time in India, would hardly be able to give a very efficient service in the Reserve. Their time in the Reserve was also limited to three years. He asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had made any calculation as to the retardation in the general progress of the Reserve caused by the adoption of the nine-years system, and the stoppage of recruiting for short service. The question was of vital importance, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to assure the country that an efficient, economic, and powerful Reserve was increasing in a satisfactory manner.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) endorsed all the right hon. Baronet had said with reference to the great utility and strength of the Reserve in the late war, but he thought there was another point of considerable importance. The increase in this Vote would suggest that there had been an unexpected addition to the Reserve, but that was a practical impossibility as the number of men who would go to the Reserve in the course of the year could be calculated very closely. There might be a slight variation in the number of men who re-engaged, but the variation was so small that it could not materially alter the Estimates, and therefore he strongly protested against an under-estimate of £10,000. He protested against these Estimates being £10,000 wrong. There had occurred a miscalculation in regard to deferred pay, and no satisfactory reason was given for it, and he did not think any justifiable reason could be given for the miscalculation in connection with this Vote. Why could they not have these Estimates right in the first instance? Now that they had got soldiers looking after matters in the War Office he hoped they would be able to bring forward true Estimates instead of theoretical ones. He thought the Secretary of State for War ought to answer the right hon. Baronet's question about the condition of the Reserve. They had had a vague statement about it being all right, but that was hardly sufficient. He could not pass over this Vote without some further explanation, and he begged to move its reduction by £20 as a protest against the miscalculations of the War Office.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head Y (Pay, etc., of Army Reserve) be reduced by £20."—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said these Estimates appeared to have been prepared with the greatest possible carelessness. He agreed with all that the hon. Member for Lichfield had said upon this point. How was it that they could not tell at the War Office how many men would be on the Reserve next year, and what amount of money would be required. Why should the Estimates be out to the extent of £10,000? They never failed to hear of it when the Estimates were short, but he should like to know what became of the savings when the Estimates were too much. What had become of the savings which must have been effected under some of the heads of expenditure connected with the War Office? He joined in the protest which had been made against this Vote because he considered a deficiency of £10,000 was most excessive, and could only have been brought about by great carelessness.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.) said the hon. Baronet opposite had asked a question with regard to the Reserve. He did not think a more important matter could have been raised. With regard to the number of the Reserve it stood at 80,000 men, and, as far as he had been able to ascertain, instead of there being any likelihood of a falling-off the War Office were confident that there would be an addition considerably in excess of the normal number which would raise the Reserve to 100,000 men. The hon. Member for Lichfield had asked why they could not anticipate the number that would pass into the Reserve more accurately, and he wished to know why it was impossible to make this calculation with the same certainty as other Departments. In this case they had to deal with the will and inclination of individual men, and they were absolutely unable to forecast what would be the disposition of any particular man when he had to make his choice. In an Estimate of £700,000 he thought £10,000 was not a large miscalculation. When the men had the option of passing into the Reserve or of remaining with the colours, it was impossible to forecast, with absolute accuracy, what would take place. When the enlistments were for one period and the men had no option, they could easily calculate because they could control it by preventing men going into the Reserve. There was no such possibility under the present system, and so there must remain a certain amount of uncertainty such as was represented by this £10,000.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said the fact that the right hon. Gentleman could tell them what the Reserve was likely to be next year showed that the War Office had some idea as to what would be required. They knew what number was likely to go to the Reserve, and so they ought to be more accurate. He did not think his right hon. friend's question had been answered. It was true that there would be an increase this year, next year, and the year after, because men had been enlisting on the three-years system. The question was whether the Reserve would be injured in the future when the three-years enlisting ceased. That was the point they wanted information upon, and not as to what the Reserve was going to be next year. The Secretary of State for India used his whole energies to get up the Reserve to a large number, and he succeeded at the expense of the drafts for India. They wanted to know what the expense of the Reserve would be. They knew the Reserve was increasing, for that was obvious to everybody, but they wanted to know what was likely to happen three years hence when the system of recruiting began to tell to the detriment of the Reserve. The War Office could make a fairly accurate estimate if they only took the trouble to go into the matter carefully before the Estimates were made out.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said he did not feel inclined to quarrel with the War Office because of the discrepancy in their original Estimate, because individual opinion and option amongst the soldiers must introduce a large element of uncertainty. Nevertheless he was glad that his hon. friend's Motion had given him an opportunity of asking a few questions about the Army Reserve. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would answer a little more fully the question as to the probable future strength of the Reserve when the new nine years with the colours order came into operation. They admitted that it was necessary to have recourse to strong measures for the Indian drafts. He did not know how long the right hon. Gentleman contemplated maintaining an enlistment of nine years with the colours, and three years with the Reserve. Until they knew that they could not tell what the condition of the Reserve would be in the future. The Secretary of State for India told them that they would have an unparalleled Reserve, and he would like to remind the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War that, even if it reached 100,000, that would be short of the number contemplated by his predecessor, who placed it at 150,000. He never approved or agreed with the scheme of the Secretary of State for India, and he did not quarrel with the Secretary of State for War for taking measures to reverse it, but he thought the condition of the Reserve in the future was going to be serious. Why was the full service of the soldier always limited to twelve years? Why should the period not exceed twelve years? He would suggest to the Secretary of State for War that he might to a certain extent bridge over the unusual period of nine years with the colours if he would extend the Reserve period of those who enlisted for twelve years for, say, two or three years, making the total with the colours fifteen years. That would remove a legitimate cause of anxiety as to the position of the Reserve in the future. What they did as regards the Reserve now would not operate for a considerable time, but when it did operate it would be quite beyond their control to alter it. When the three-years system had worked itself out they would find a shortage in the Reserve, and it would not be possible to fill it up until a considerable number of years had elapsed. The right hon. Gentleman might know reasons which would render the suggestion now made inadmissible, but he thought that, having regard to the condition of the Army Reserve, the Committee had a right to ask a fuller statement with regard to the future, and especially in reference to the obligations we had contracted towards India.

*Sɪʀ A. HAYTER asked what was the calculation made by the experts of the War Office of the retardation of the rate of increase of the numbers going into the Reserve when the system of three years service was dropped and the system of nine years service adopted.

Mr. Winston Churchill.

Mʀ. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that he had not anticipated that on the Supplementary Estimates the full policy of the Army would have been discussed, but as far as he could answer hon. Gentlemen opposite he would do so. To answer the question put by the right hon. Baronet it would be necessary to form an actuarial calculation, which would vary according to the period of time during which long-service recruiting was maintained. He could furnish it as accurately as these calculations could be made, but, of course, the contingency had been taken fully into account. The problem was to rehabilitate the infantry by introducing a number of men capable of furnishing the Indian drafts and performing the duties of their battalions. They were at present taking these men at the rate of about 500 a week, and at that rate they would have got some 30,000 men in addition in about ten months. They could not count with certainty upon that rate of recruiting throughout the whole year, for it depended to a certain extent upon the season and the demands upon other branches of the Army; but he thought he was not putting the probability too high when he said that ten or twelve months would enable them, not to get the whole number they required, but so to stiffen the battalions that it would be possible to enter upon short-service recruiting. They could not, of course, eat their cake and have it. There must be a very small diminution of the Reserve in years to come in respect to these few months which were now passing; but he would remind hon. Members that that would take effect, if at all, some eight years hence, and that the Reservists who were now going into the Reserve had nine, and in some cases ten years, to serve with the Reserve. Of course, it was perfectly obvious that, if short-service recruiting on the lines which he had recommended to the House were adopted, when the time came in the opinion of the Army Council to resume it they would, by means of the difference between the two and three years colour service, easily replace whatever deficit there might be eight or nine years hence arising from the intermission of the full entry into the Reserve during the next six months.

When hon. Members took this alarmist view of the ultimate condition of the Reserve he would remind them that, taking it at the very worst and were the present system permanent, which it was not intended to be, the difference would be very small compared with the result of the old system. He did not believe that there was any ground for apprehension in this matter. In any case the ultimate reduction in the Reserve would be very small, and he was confident that, so far as it was felt at all, it would be more than repaired by the short-service recruiting which must eventually be resorted to.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said the right hon. Gentleman had not replied to that part of the speech of the hon. Member for Oldham in which reference was made to the arrangement with India. Could the right hon. Gentleman reply to that portion of the speech?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the War Office were fulfilling their obligations to India. They were sending to India men who under the old regulations would not have been allowed to go, but that had been done with the full concurrence of the India Office.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he presumed that the right hon. Gentleman was speaking, not of men sent out in connection with the Reserve, but men going out under the regular age.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that was not what he was referring to. The requirements of the Indian Government were that men should have a definite time of service, and they had now waived that point.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that the point he had to put to the right hon. Gentleman was whether the Indian authorities were not led to believe that in return for the expenditure of £700,000 a year they would be provided in future with a Reserve at home of not less than 150,000 men, who would be at their disposal whenever necessity arose.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) said the question was whether the Indian authorities were not led to believe that by the expenditure of £700,000 they would be provided with a Reserve of 150,000 which would be at the disposal of India whenever called upon, and whether, in that matter, faith had not been broken with India. It appeared to him that India had been unfairly dealt with.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the hon. Member for Oldham had asked why the period with the colours should be limited to twelve years. He would suggest to the Secretary of State for War that the example of the Navy should be followed in the Army in regard to the period of service. The Navy took a man for twenty-two or twenty-four years, and, at the end of the period, gave him a shilling a day. What a man who was going into the Army or the Navy wanted to know was that he was making provision for life. The question he himself wanted to raise went much more to the root of the matter. What was it that justified the right hon. Gentleman at this time in asking for the extra sum of money stated in the Supplementary Estimate? Why not provide for it in the original Estimates? What new emergency had driven the right hon. Gentleman to ask the money, thereby breaking the bargain made on the original statement as between the House of Commons, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the country. The Committee would observe that when this item for the expenses of the Reserve came before them last year on the original Estimate, there was an increase of no less than £210,000. That was a stupendous increase. The sum asked for and voted was £690,000. Unless it could be shown that there was something which prevented any possibility of knowing circumstances which had emerged since the original Estimate was made, and which had rendered the Supplementary Estimate necessary, he meant to vote against the Supplementary Estimate. Mr. Gladstone had said that if ever a Government desired to strike at the root of the control of Parliament it was by Supplementary Estimates that they could do it.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) said many Members were surprised at what had fallen from the Secretary of State for

War on the question of the Reserve. They now heard for the first time that it was not proposed to continue the long-service Army, and they did not know what was to come in its place. As the hon. Member for King's Lynn had said, there were many great advantages in a long-service Army; but if they were really to have a short-service Army or to adopt the new method of enlisting the Militia for foreign service, what use was there in adopting another method of enlistment? It was very unwise to change the term of enlistment often, as it disturbed recruiting. Could the Secretary of State for War state whether the term was to be reduced from nine years to seven years, six years, or what? Many hon. Members were anxious to know what was to be done, so that they might not be constantly arguing in a circle.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that Lord Lansdowne had created in 1898 a special Reserve limited to 5,000 or 6,000 men who, in consideration of a slightly increased wage, were under liability to be called up for active service in small expeditions without the necessity of calling out the whole Reserve by Act of Parliament. Was that special Reserve in existence, and was it paid for out of any part of the Estimate the Committee were now discussing? He knew that the right hon. Gentleman said last year that we had not the power to send a single Reservist on foreign service without the sanction of an Act of Parliament, but the right hon. Gentleman overlooked this special Reserve of 5,000 or 6,000 men.

Captain NORTON said that the right hon. Gentleman had said that owing to his having been obliged by the dearth of long-service men to send abroad a considerable number of short-service soldiers last year and this, consequently a much larger Reserve would be required this year than 150,000 men. He wanted some further explanation on the point.

Mr. O'MARA said he was not a miltary expert but he had been rather surprised to hear some talk of keeping a Reserve in this country of 150,000 men for India. What provision was made for sending these Reserves to India in case of a war with Russia or a native rising, and how long would it take them to go to India?

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. O'MARA said that if the Reservists were kept in this country of what use were they unless they could be sent——

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! That will come under another Vote.

Mr. O'MARA said that the only other use of a Reserve in this country was to defend our shores, and no one could regret any expense for that. He had been much relieved, however, when the First Lord of the Treasury said that there was no serious danger of an invasion of this country.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not entitled to wander over the whole field of Army expenditure.

Mr. O'MARA said that if there were to be Reserves, he took it that they were to be Reserves for a certain class of work.

The CHAIRMAN: I have warned the hon. Member more than once that he must be relevant.

Mr. O'MARA said he had always the greatest pleasure in carrying out the ruling of the Chairman, but, with all due respect, this was a Supplementary Estimate for £10,000 for the pay of the Reserve, and he took it that that £10,000 was required to increase the number of Reserves in this country. Consequently he might refer to the use to which these Reserves might be put. Therefore he said that the First Lord of the Treasury had relieved their minds to some extent when he said that the military authorities did not think there was any need to keep a Reserve in this country to repel foreign invasion. If this Vote was carried to a division he should certainly vote in favour of the Amendment.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said it was hardly fair to the Committee for the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to allow all those questions to go unanswered.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that a similar question to that asked by the hon. Member for King's Lynn had been asked by another hon. Member, and he had answered it so far as he could. He would defy the hon. Gentleman, if he were in his position or in that of the military authorities, to be so wise as to be able to tell at the beginning of a year how many men would remain with the colours and how many would go into the Reserve. The hon. Member for Oldham asked a question about the A Reserve. He believed that it had lately gone up and was now 84,000 in number. The hon. Member for King's Lynn had asked why not enlist men for a longer period of service, and he cited the Navy. The position of the two services was quite different. In the Army, above all things, they wanted a great power of expansion in case of war, while he should say that in case of war the accommodation for men on ship board would diminish. It was because of the necessity of creating in peace time a large Reserve that they had to take into consideration the terms of enlistment.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he was one of the few Members in the House who was not prepared at a moment's notice to become Lord High Admiral of the Navy or Commander-in-Chief of the Army. He knew little about the Vote under discussion, but observed that it was proposed to reduce it by £20. His great regret was that the reduction moved was not greater. He had one system in regard to these Votes under present circumstances. There was a difficulty in getting rid of this Government, and he would act on the old constitutional principle of doing his best to absolutely refuse Supply. He therefore intended to vote for the reduction of £20 or of £20,000,000. He had no confidence in the Government; he was not prepared to trust them in any shape or form, and he was not willing to give them, if he could help it, a shilling to be wasted and squandered.

The CHAIRMAN asked if the hon. Member for Lichfield would move the reduction of the Vote by £100 instead of £20.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER said he had no objection whatever.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that in agreeing to increase the reduction from £20 to £100 he hoped they would not be told by the Secretary of State for War that they were endeavouring to keep the British soldier out of £100 of reserve pay.

Question put, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head Y (Pay, etc., of Army Reserve) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 204; Noes, 261. (Division List No. 28.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, T.Gibson(King'sLynn
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Cap.EC(St.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R.C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt.Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hammond John
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshr)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJoseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Charles M.(Durham
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliff
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse, SirJT.(H'ddersfi'ld
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Warner and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn. A.J. (Manch'r.)
Balfour, Rt Hn. GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H F(Middlesex
Brigg, John
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. JA. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H.M. (DublinUniv
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn. JA. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar,SirT.R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred.Dixon
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke,Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, SirR.B.(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick,SW
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredrk.
Gordon, Hn. J.E(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. Wednesbury
Greene, SirEW.(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords., N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.
Jameson, Major J. Eustace

Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir J. (Monm'th)
Lawson, Hn.H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee, Arthur H(Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.- Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col, Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J.H. (Dumfriessh,
Meysey-Thomposn, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir FrederickG
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. W. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.

Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, HC.(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,RtHnJ. Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn. J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H.(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn. Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (AshtonundLyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said the Vote they were now discussing differed in some degree from those which had already been discussed, because, although it was put down as a Supplemental Estimate, it was really an additional Estimate. It was a difficult Vote to examine, because at one time or another the India Office, the War Office, and the Foreign Office had been concerned with the events which made the Vote necessary. One curious feature of this Vote was that while it was a terminal charge for winding up events in Somaliland, it incidentally provided for a garrison which had almost become permanent. Last year there were two mentions of the Vote in the King's Speech, but no Vote; now they had the exact opposite, they had two Votes and no mention. In 1899 we were invited to take a military promenade in Somaliland. At the time this country was engaged in a military promenade in another part of Africa, and the Government did not propose to engage in two at the same time, but in 1901 we entered on our first campaign. In the campaign our arms were successful, the Mullah was defeated with considerable loss, and the local officer proposed that we should take over the local administrative control of the country. Lord Lansdowne refused to entertain any such proposition, but Colonel Sadler, the local officer, warned Lord Lansdowne that if he did not assume the administrative control he would not have seen the last of the Mullah. That was proved to be true in a very short time. In 1902 we entered into our second campaign, when, unfortunately, the Mullah got the better of us. At this time the Foreign Office had the control, and becoming alarmed at the want of success of their military enterprise they handed over the whole thing to the War Office. The War Office immediately got hold of the services of an old Indian and Afghan fighter, General Manning, and sent him over to Somaliland with 8,000 men. But they also did another thing which had a very wide-reaching effect, and that was to invite the co-operation of the Italian nation.

In 1903 the third campaign was commenced. On March 3rd the then Secretary of State for War declared that operations would probably last four months and cost £500,000 or £600,000. On April 11th the general officer was committed by one of his subordinates to a most unfortunate engagement in which he was overwhelmed, his force annihilated, and he himself killed, while the whole expedition was endangered, disorganised, and had eventually to be withdrawn. About the time when the present Secretary of State entered upon his office, Sir Charles Egerton, an Indian officer of great experience and skill, was brought from India to take charge of the expedition, and to him was entrusted a force of about 10,000 men. So that this "military promenade" had developed into operations of considerable magnitude, involving an expenditure of some millions of money, and the employment of 500 or 600 officers, most of whom were on special employment. In December the expedition started afresh, and at the beginning of 1904 the Mullah was decisively defeated, his forces scattered, and apparently the War Office were in hopes that the whole campaign was coming to an end. The Secretary of State, however, used words of unusual caution, stating that the position was more favourable, but that if their anticipations were once more disappointed they would certainly be face to face with a campaign in the following year. In February operations ceased for the moment, but on March 10th they began again in a very desultory and unsatisfactory manner, and they came finally to an end on April 18th with the capture of Illig, a mud-hut town in Italian territory, entirely controlled by the Italian Government and of no sort of value whatever. To this obscure village we had to send a naval force, and in the course of the operations suffered loss of both men and officers, while the Italian ships and troops took no steps whatever to expel the Mullah from the Italian territory. It was to be noted that the operations came to an end on April 18th. But if the Foreign Office and the War Office had paid attention to the original representations of their local advisers they would not have commenced operations until the middle of April, they would not have incurred one-half of the expenditure they had incurred, and they would not have been troubled with the difficulties of transport and lack of water which had brought the campaign to an end with such loss and suffering to the troops.

In the middle of April the Secretary of State for War stated that the Mullah had been routed, driven out of the protectorate and was practically without a following. He also added that in view of these circumstances it had been decided to discontinue the military operations, and to reduce the field force. That statement naturally led the House to believe that the campaign had been entirely successful, and that there was no necessity, from a military point of view, to continue the operations. But a telegram sent by General Egerton just before that date, and printed on page 48 of the Paper, showed that the real cause of the withdrawal was not success but necessity. Everybody would wish to hear willing testimonies to the valour and skill of the troops engaged, but it could not be denied that the hardships they endured with so much courage might have been mitigated, if not altogether prevented, if the advice of the people on the spot had been accepted. The country was indebted to the troops for their struggles in a thankless and arduous task, but there was not much gratitude due to the Government which directed the operations at the wrong season of the year. Then there was the question of the Italian co-operation, which, he submitted, had been expensive and was also unnecessary. From page 48 of the Paper it would be seen that the Mullah's following came from Italian and not British territory, though they raided both impartially, and representations ought to have been made to the Italian Government that it was their duty to keep their subjects under control. Had that course been taken our expenses would have been less, and our efforts lighter, while our success, he believed, would have been equally as great.

He thought it was just as well to look at the expense of all these proceedings. The Secretary of State had given several answers as to the cost of this undertaking, and he had told them that the cost was £2,494,000, but he arrived at a larger figure than that. Up to October, 1902, the cost of operations as directed by the Foreign Office amounted to £90,000. Then the sum of £2,250,000 was voted to the War Office as expenditure upon the conduct of military affairs. The Secretary of State, in an answer he gave to the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division on February 29th last year, pointed out that £200,000 of this sum came from appropriations-in-aid, and therefore it was not necessary to reckon that amount in the sum spent. Then there was this Vote for £536,000 to-day, and apparently, in addition, grants-in-aid to the amount of £159,000. These figures made up a total of £3,035,000, which was a considerable increase upon the estimate made by the Secretary of State for War. That was the sum actually spent. Appropriations-in-aid ought not to be counted in the cost, but they ought to be devoted to reducing other expenditure. Then there was this year a large administrative Vote for £78,000. What had been the result of all this expenditure? There had been four campaigns, the trade of the country had been decreased, and the Mullah was still at large.

What then was to be the future policy with regard to this country? It seemed to him that three courses were open to the Government. They could completely abandon the country, but he did not suppose they would do that; they could keep up a perpetual garrison, but economy would prevent that; or they could establish a system of administrative control of the protectorate. Having promised protection to the friendly tribes it would be a breach of national honour if they were now to withdraw it. It might be said that administrative control was a difficult thing in those wild parts, but this was not the only instance where our frontier was invested by tribes addicted to brigandage, and the whole of the Indian frontier consisted of a population of that character. In many cases those tribes were controlled by a single officer. They were all familiar with the case of Colonel Warburton, who kept the tribes in perfect order without any armed force, and when he was withdrawn the country broke out in rebellion. He believed such a system based on moral influence was possible in those regions. It had been successful in India, and was undoubtedly economical. In the King's Speech last year they were told that the Government had adopted three courses. They had dealt out rifles to the various tribesmen and put them under British officers; they had included Somaliland in the postal union, in order, he could only suppose, that the Mullah might more easily get ammunition and arms; and they had issued an Order in Council which provided for the appointment of a Commissioner. That was a gloomy anticipation for the career of the administrator in Somaliland. There was another provision which seemed to have been tempered by prudence. It was that the demarcation of the boundaries of the country was to be by proclamation. It was quite clear that so long as the Mullah was alive and at large it would be quite impossible to delimit any part of this protectorate. So far as he understood, no officer had been appointed to carry on the Government. In the words of the Prime Minister, the subject of Somaliland was interesting and embarrassing. It was more interesting and embarrassing because of a question put from the Opposition benches which had never been answered. The question was, Will the Mullah come back? Until that question could be answered nobody could say what would be the future of Somaliland. The latest information they had of the Mullah was that he had 2,000 rifles and 6,000 spears at his back. He did not know whether the Secretary of State could give any new information as to the whereabouts of this gentleman, but it was quite clear that he was in a state of power and still had sufficient force at his back to do a great deal of damage. It seemed to him that the situation required a certain amount of prudence, foresight, and resolution, none of which qualities had been conspicuously present in the past management of this country. This was particularly the sort of question which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite always claimed that they could manage much better than the Liberals could. He had always been told that the Conservative Party could manage foreign affairs far better than the Liberal Party. The situation created in Somaliland was an actual contradiction of that assertion, for from its inception the matter had been mishandled and misconceived. He hoped that before this debate came to an end they might get an explanation from the Government without exaggeration and without reserve. He begged to move that the Vote be reduced by £10,000.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), in seconding the Amendment, said they ought to ask the Government for a clear declaration of what they thought they had won by the war in Somaliland. What results had they to show? It was the companion piece to the Tibetan Expedition. There they had some results. They had made some geographical discoveries, they had enabled some treatises to be written on an obscure Theocracy, and they had irritated Russia. In Somaliland they were not even dragging the Mad Mullah at the chariot wheels of the Secretary of State for War. The one tangible result was the expenditure of these millions. They had heard from the hon. Member for Bristol a calculation as to how much the Government had spent. How did the Secretary of State for War explain the figures which he gave to the House in the debate last year, when he stated that the expenditure up to that date was £3,000,000? The Government said they had accomplished their object. But where was the Mad Mullah? There was a curious confession during the debate last year by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, who, when the expedition was commenced, was a member of the Government. Having left the Government, he said in the debate last year that he did not believe His Majesty's Ministers would have entered upon an expedition of that kind if they had dreamed for a moment that it was going to reach the present size. Was not that like our present rulers? At the beginning of the war they were ill-informed, hasty and over-sanguine, accepting the report of their representative on the spot without any real consideration as to whether he was exaggerating owing to the fact that naturally events occurring under his eye were of greater magnitude than they should be to the Ministry, which had to keep the whole Empire under its view. They accepted the word of comparatively obscure officials in Somaliland, and came to the conclusion that the Mullah was a serious danger and must be suppressed at all consequences. There had really been four expeditions—one British defeat, three disappearances of the Mad Mullah, and three reappearances of the same gentleman. Now what security had the Government that the Mad Mullah was not going to reappear? The stream had gone underground for a little while, but how did they know that it was not going to re-appear? Last year he was still fighting the Mijzarten tribe, and the Government said that there was no date at which it could be declared that military operations would be terminated. And last year Lieutenant-General Sir C. Egerton reported—

> "To actually capture a man whose whole range of movement extends from Cape Guardafui to the Equator, and from the sea to the Abyssinian border, is an almost hopeless task, and could only be attained by an extraordinary piece of luck."

The Government went into war as gamblers, in the hope of coming out with a streak of luck! They knew no relation between their means and the ends which they had in view. There were some things which it was worth while to do on the cheap, if they could really do them. The capture of a border raider might have been worth while undertaking if it could have been accomplished without enormous expense; but it was not worth while spending millions in hunting down a man who might be suppressed either by judicious defensive measures on the spot, or by cutting off his supplies. The Government had made no attempt to thus deal with this gentleman. On the word of the people in Somaliland they sent out a large expedition, and the result had been an enormous loss of national money and another addition to the immense extravagance of which the Government was guilty and for which they cared so little.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head BB (Somaliland Expeditionary Force) be reduced by £10,000."—(*Mr. Charles Hobhouse.*)

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.) said he thought that the hon. Member who seconded the reduction of this Vote had imported into the discussion rather a different sort of tone from that in which it had been started by the hon. Member for Bristol. It was rather unfortunate that some of his criticisms were directly contradictory of the criticisms of the hon. Member who moved the reduction, whose main charge was that the Government had not taken the advice of their representatives on the spot. A different view was taken by the hon. Member for Elland, whose whole complaint was that the Government had accepted at once the opinions of their local representatives, and had landed this country in this very heavy and costly war. He could not help thinking that the strategical notions of the hon. Member for Elland were rather crude and elementary. Curiosity as to the movements of the Mullah was not confined to hon. Members on the other side of the House. He himself was anxious to obtain a full statement from the Government as to the results of their policy, and, of what was more important, their future policy. They had the advantage of the combined presence of the Secretary of State for War and the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, the latter of whom had something to do with controlling military expeditions. He could not help observing that it was a little curious that up to 1898 the Indian Government had had charge of Somaliland, but all these disturbances had occurred in that country after its management was taken over by the Foreign Office. Of course, our position in Somaliland was strategical, and based on general policy; and therefore the Foreign Office wished to have it under their control. They had been told in another connection that the policy of the Indian Government was a portion of a general policy of this country, and that the Indian Government was only a department of the Foreign Office. Consequently, it did not much matter whether Somaliland was controlled by the Foreign Office or by the Indian Office. However, the Indian Government had already the control of Aden, which itself controlled Somaliland. He thought that the House ought to inquire more generally as to the policy which governed in this matter. These small wars should not be regarded as a piece of the providential order of this country, or as a portion of that necessary toll which we had to pay for the maintenance of our Empire.

In all these cases it was necessary to examine with the greatest care what were the steps the necessity for which led this country into the war. The hon. Member opposite did not go into the beginnings of the case. He assumed that this country had undertaken obligations towards the tribes in Somaliland which, as a matter of honour, we should maintain.

It was, therefore, all the more necessary that the real measure of our obligations in the future should be ascertained. Were these obligations to continue binding for an indefinite number of years, or could any term be set to them? He understood that the obligations were not merely undertaken for the benefit of the Somaliland tribes, and it became of extreme importance how far our protectorate over these tribes should be extended, and whether the trade of the Hinterland should be considered a matter of vital importance. Hon. Members must remember that this was a vast country; it was 500 miles by 350, and to follow a man like the Mullah over such an enormous district as that was really an impossible task, as those who had been in that country on sporting expeditions knew. He would like to know whether a really smashing blow had been delivered against the Mullah, because this was a matter of prestige. The position of a man like the Mullah depended not on the size of the force which he commanded as much as upon his religious position. This particular Mullah obtained his position, not by success in war, but his success in what might be called revivalist meetings; the number of pilgrimages he had made to Mecca and the great receptions he had met with there. There was, and certainly must be, an immense difficulty connected with the maintenance of order and the protection of a country like this with a large hinterland behind it. It was extremely difficult to get proper information about the country in the way it was possible to obtain it in Egypt, and it was difficult to say when a rising would occur again. In this war itself we had to deal not with one Mullah but two. And the second also showed some military pretensions. If we had to keep a force in the protectorate it must necessarily be an expensive one, because if we had to maintain a force ready to meet 3,000 or 4,000 mounted riflemen and 60,000 or 80,000 spearmen it must be a very large one.

This brought him to the future policy of the Government with regard to this protectorate. He thought the duty of patrolling the coast so as to prevent arms being brought to the inland tribes should be divided between this country and Italy, because a very large portion of the coast to be patrolled was in the Italian protectorate. The predecessor of the noble Lord, in answer to a question, stated that the number of troops it would be necessary to maintain in Somaliland in order to secure that there should be a cordon of military stations round our protectorate was estimated at 10,000 men. That was a preposterous force to maintain in such a part of the world. What was to be the composition of the force, if a force had to be maintained? They had had descriptions of the sort of men the Somalis were for this purpose. The testimony of the men who commanded them was that the Somalis had astonishing powers of endurance, but that in many other ways they were not desirable troops; that they were an extremely excitable people, and, though they were quick to learn the use of the rifle, we undoubtedly suffered very much from having so many men who lost their heads, and whom it was impossible to control when they got into the fighting line. Therefore, it became a question whether, if we were going to garrison the country and maintain a chain of posts round the protectorate, we should not have to station permanently in the country some of the East African, or bring over Indian troops to add that stiffening to the Somali levees which was absolutely necessary for the security of the country. Asked recently as to the number of troops it would be necessary to maintain in the protectorate, the noble Lord was unable to say, but he informed the House that there were then in that country two Indian regiments and two regiments of mounted infantry, which were kept there pending the organisation of a local force.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND).

*MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.) said in moving the Resolution standing in his name he would confine himself almost exclusively to the genesis of that Resolution. He himself had the honour on two occasions to be evicted from his holding, and on that account he sympathised with the present Government, whose eviction from office was impending The writ of ejectment was out, and whether they waited until the end of the septennial period or went to the country in the near future, they would have to surrender their holding, but he hoped for certain reasons that the evicting forces would not be proportionably as great as they were in, at least, one of his evictions. On that occasion it was thought necessary to send a company of soldiers and 150 constabulary men to protect the sheriff in the execution of his duty, though there was only himself and his two farm servants on the other side. He had almost forgotten to mention that there was an ambulance wagon to take away the wounded had the expected battle taken place. The rent of the farm from which he was evicted had since been reduced by legislation of this House by no less than 60 or 70 per cent., which he contended fully justified him in the position he took up in refusing to pay his landlord more than could be produced out of the land. The second time he was evicted was in 1895, and by that eviction his landlord confiscated all the improvements he had made, which were more than three times the value of the farm. He had never been an insolvent tenant and could always pay his rent, but not out of what the soil produced, and therefore he had thought it right for the sake of the other tenants in Ireland to take the stand he had taken.

The relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland were not the same as, he had been given to understand, they were in this country. The relationship there was that of master and slave; of a despotic ruler and his subjects. If a man failed to pay his rent he was regarded as a man might be who was guilty of high treason; no compromise was possible; no concessions could be made because of the failure of crops or mortality in cattle or other good reason. Writs were issued, the eviction proceeded with, and the man and his family thrown out on the roadside. Then the landlord, after he had got rid of a tenant whose family had perhaps for generations paid a certain rent, would hand over that farm to a stranger for 30 or 40 or 50 per cent. less. One tenant of whom he could speak paid a rent of £56 a year; he was at one time unable to pay; there was no reduction made to him; he was evicted and the farm was at once handed over to another man at a rental of £35. His point was why did not the original tenant get the first chance of the reduction, or of some reduction? It was the practice of one landlord in his own immediate neighbourhood to drop into his tenants' houses at dinner time and lift the lid of the pot on the fire, and if he saw as much as a piece of bacon in the pot he increased the rent immediately, and if he found a new overcoat on any of his tenants he did the same thing. The tenants of that landlord were perhaps the most industrious and hard working men in the whole county of Tipperary. They were evicted in 1882, and twelve years after were in negotiation with their old landlord to purchase their holdings, which they succeeded in doing. Any one looking at those farms now would think that a benevolent fairy had by a touch of her wand transformed a desolate waste into a veritable Garden of Eden. Stone houses and buildings had replaced the original hovels in which these people lived, and twice the value could be obtained from the land than could be obtained under the old system. Surely that was a benefit not only to Ireland but the whole world. One or two more examples and he would have done. The landlord of the Glenbane Estate, near Lattin in the county of Tipperary took it into his head to raise the rents of his tenants by 10s. an acre every half gale. This went on till the rent reached the figure of £6 10s. At this point two tenants broke down and were evicted. But at this point also the landlord, who resided in this country, found refuge in a lunatic asylum and had not since been heard of. His (the speaker's) point was that under English land laws in Ireland even a lunatic could create evicted tenants. He would mention one other kind of landlord. Tom Dowling of Tipperary was an auctioneer. He went into the Encumbered Estates Court and purchased the Cappawhite Estate in his (Mr. O'Brien's) constituency without a penny in his pocket. He paid for it by a mortgage on the estate itself, and his intention was to set up as a country gentleman on the margin between the difference payable as interest on the mortgage, and the amount he could screw out of the tenants by raising the rent. But unfortunately for him the Land League stepped in at the time, and poor Tom was bowled over. He might mention that all the examples he had given were from within a circle of twelve miles diameter, and he assumed it was much the same throughout Ireland. He had not much hope that immediate benefit to the evicted tenants would follow this discussion, because the great English Parties had much larger fish to fry, but whether the Svengali of Birmingham continued to hypnotise the Government Trilby, or the Unionist hairs at the tip of the tail continued to wag the Tory dog, or whether the indefinite incoherent homogeneity on the Government side was replaced by the definite coherent heterogeneity on the Opposition side, including some Tories in Liberal overcoats, the House might rest assured that the Irish people would not forget the sacrifice of the evicted tenants, and the voice of Ireland would be heard, in season and out of season, until the last evicted tenant was reinstated.

*Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.) said he rose for the purpose of seconding the Motion of his hon. friend; and he hoped to show the House that, on this question, the Government had broken faith, not only with the evicted tenants, but also with the Irish Party. At the time the Land Bill was being introduced, and long before it, the Irish Members, yes, and the Irish people, were led to believe that the conciliatory and friendly spirit displayed at the Land Conference would be loyally observed by the landlords; and that the Bill would be the means of establishing permanent peace in Ireland. Everyone who knew anything about Ireland would admit that it would be impossible to establish that peace without a settlement of the evicted tenants' question; and it was on the strength of such representations that the Government were allowed to pass the Bill in its present form. In support of that contention he desired to give to the House a few quotations from speeches delivered on this question by the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary and other not less influential members of the Government. Speaking on the introduction of the Bill, the late Chief Secretary stated that he believed that the Irish landlords and tenants would continue to act in the charitable and reasonable spirit of the Land Conference Report and he concluded that speech in the following words—

> "All interests landlord and tenant, Nationalist and Unionist, British and Irish, can hope for no tolerable issue to any view constitutional, political, or economic, which they severally may cherish until by settling the Irish land question we achieve social reconciliation in Ireland."

On a later occasion, in discussing Clause 11 of the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman stated—

> "That the words of the clause were strong enough to cover all the powers at present possessed by the Congested Districts Board, including the power to buy out the interest of an existing tenant in order to put another tenant on the holding. The power is ample for all the purposes that the hon. Member has in mind, and recognising as I do the great desirability of making a final settlement which shall leave no bitter memories behind I fully intend that these powers shall be used."

Had that settlement been carried out, or had those powers been used? He would ask the House to consider what the Land Conference recommended in connection with the evicted tenants' question. In his judgment it was little when compared with the sacrifices made by those men. "The Report declared that any project for the solution of the Irish land question should be accompanied by a settlement of the evicted tenants' question on an equitable basis." Mild as that recommendation undoubtedly was, the Government practically ignored it. Lord Lansdowne, speaking in the House of Lords, stated—

> "That the one recommendation in the Bill which commended itself to him was that he saw in it the restoration of lasting peace and goodwill between landlord and tenants in Ireland.
>
> "Lord Barrymore" he added "expressed his regret that the question of the evicted tenants had been brought into the Bill; but, surely, if the noble Lord had followed, as no doubt he did, the discussions which took place elsewhere, he must know that this provision, which contemplated the possibility of the restoration of the evicted tenants to their holdings, was an essential element in the compromise, and if that element had been excluded, it was possible that the Bill would not at that moment be before their Lordships' House."

The Prime Minister, speaking on the Second Reading of the Bill, said that—

> "It was intended to take away one of those sores which festered and aggravated every political movement which might otherwise be innocuous."

He submitted that there was no sore in Ireland to-day that festered or corroded more than that of the evicted tenants; and therefore the Government stood convicted of having obtained the Land Act under false pretences.

He desired to refer to two estates in the county of Galway, with which he was intimately acquainted—namely, the Clanricarde Estate and the Lewis Estate. They were typical of many other estates in Ireland on which evicted tenants were to be found. He asked the late Chief Secretary a week ago how many applications the Commissioners had received from evicted tenants on those estates, and also how many tenants had been reinstated. The reply was that 122 applications had been received from the Clanricarde Estate, but that only two tenants had been provided with farms elsewhere. Twenty applications were received from the Lewis Estate, but not one tenant had been reinstated or otherwise provided for. There they had 140 families on those two estates practically in the same position to-day as if the Bill had never been passed. He did not complain so much of the administration of the Act as of its defects; for he was aware that, no matter how sympathetically it might be administered, it would not have the slightest effect on such estates as he had mentioned. Last August Mr. Stewart, an inspector under the Estates Commissioners, called on a son of Mrs. Lewis, who managed the estate, with reference to the evicted tenants. Immediately afterwards a letter appeared in the Dublin *Daily Express* from that gentleman complaining that Mr. Stewart had used intimidatory language towards him in connection with the matter. Mr. Stewart denied it. The result of that correspondence had been to put a stop to further advances on the part of the Estates Commissioners. I believe Lord Clanricarde's agent was also approached and that certain inducements were held out to him if he would co-operate in bringing about a settlement upon the estate. There were at the present moment in the parish in which he lived, viz., Woodford, five tenants under notice to quit, not for non-payment of rent, no they had paid up to the day, they did not owe one penny, but for daring to exercise their legal right in refusing to allow a cattle dealer, named Rathcliffe, from Meath to shoot over their land, because he had grabbed the farm of an evicted tenant. The only remedy for dealing with such men as Lord Clanricarde was compulsion, and he believed that if the Government would adopt that course they would find many supporters on their own side. To support that assertion he would just for a moment refer to the action of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, who was then Chief Secretary for Ireland, immediately after the evictions on the Clanricarde Estate in 1886, he sent for the then agent, Mr. Joyce, who by the way, subsequently took an action for libel against Lord Clanricarde, as did also the wife of a former agent, Mr. Blake, who was shot in his service. The right hon. Gentleman suggested to Mr. Joyce that he should advise Lord Clanricarde to act towards his tenants in the same spirit as other and poorer landlords had done, and he might add, that there were eight landlords that had property in the Woodford district, all of whom, with the exception of Lord Clanricarde and Mrs. Lewis, gave reductions from 25 to 30 per cent. with the result that friendly relations between tenants and landlords were maintained.

Mr. Joyce did act on the suggestion made to him with the result that Lord Clanricarde wrote the following letter to the right hon. Gentleman—

> "The Albany, C. 5, Piccadilly, W.C.,
>
> "October 20th, 1886.
>
> "Sir.—Mr. Francis Joyce, my agent, informs me that you sent for him and desired him to inform me that the Government would not carry out another eviction on my property until I gave back to the tenants an allowance on payment of their rent.
>
> "Of course I at first concluded my agent must have invented so incredible a message, and was playing into the hands of the Land League, and I need hardly point out to you that the message is far too grave a one to be possible that I can accept it as authentic conveyed thus as merely a verbal message of second hand, and I must therefore ask you to be good enough to let me know (1) if my

agent's statement in question is correct; and (2) As I have every wish to facilitate as far as I can reasonably the Government's (I fear feeble) attempts to govern Ireland, while on the other hand I cannot give further reductions to more tenants whose rents have been already reduced under the Land Court. Can I count on the Government's support in carrying out even evictions (should they be necessary) if I give back 20 per cent, on the rents due 1st November to those tenants who pay their rents due up to that date, and who had not had their rents reduced in the Land Court?

"I think your intimation should have been conveyed to myself directly, and at a considerably earlier date, so as to have enabled me to act before the Land League acted, as they now, of course, will claim all the thanks for any reduction I may make, and to have crushed the law and Government.

"I am, etc.,

"CLANRICARDE."

"The Right Honourable Sir
Michael Hicks-Beach."

In reply to which the right hon. Gentleman wrote—

"Viceregal Lodge,
"October 25th, 1886.

"My Lord.—I think my best reply to your letter will be to give a more complete account of the interview between Mr. Joyce and myself than you appear to have as yet received.

"Being anxious to obtain full information on the condition of that part of Ireland in which your Lordship's property is situated, I requested Mr. Joyce (amongst others) to call upon me.

"After some conversation on matters not directly affecting the subject of your letter, I referred to the great cost and trouble which had been incurred in carrying out the evictions on your Lordship's estate at Woodford. I pointed out that this was a proof of the determination of the Government to enforce the law, and they were entitled to expect in return reasonable action on the part of the landlords. I stated to Mr. Joyce, as I have to many others, my strong objection to anything like wholesale evictions, and my opinion that where it became necessary to proceed to eviction in order to obtain the rights of property, the proper way was to select a few leading cases in which the tenants were able, but declined to pay, some person being, of course, present at the eviction with full authority from the landlord to accept a settlement at the last moment, if such should be proposed.

"I pressed this rather more with regard to the possible future than on account of anything that had already occurred at Woodford, and I understood Mr. Joyce to undertake that this course should, if necessary, be pursued. I then questioned him as to the ability of your Lordship's tenants to pay their rents. He replied that he thought some could do so, but on pressure from me he admitted that he had advised you to make considerable reductions to others (he specified the Portumna district), though so far without success. I requested him to inform your Lordship that if you adhered to that decision against the advice of your own agent, and, contrary to the general action of the Irish landlords, the responsibility would be solely yours; that you might find such procedure costly and ineffective, and that in the event of application to the Government for the services of constabulary and military on such occasions, compliance with the request would certainly be retarded by the pressure of other claims and duties, and would most probably be postponed to the utmost extent permitted by law.

"You ask whether in my opinion a reduction of 20 per cent. on rents due in November from tenants not holding under judicial rents would be sufficient.

"No one but a person intimately acquainted with the condition of your tenants could measure what would be a just and fair reduction, or decide as to the classes of tenants who should to a greater or less extent be given the benefit of it.

"I do not myself know enough of the circumstances to be able to judge; but I have heard that where your tenants have applied to the Land Courts, the old rents were, in many cases, reduced by a larger percentage than you name, and Mr. Joyce will doubtless inform you how far any causes, such as the sessions, or the price of produce, or the recent floods in the Shannon valley, have injuriously affected your property since that time.

"You complain that I did not communicate directly with yourself, and at a considerable earlier date. If your Lordship resided in Ireland, I should certainly have sought an interview with you, but I admit that I thought your agent would be better acquainted than your Lordship with the condition of a property which you have not even visited for years, and that I supposed that in such circumstances you would have acted on his advice in making any necessary reductions to your tenants.

"In your opinion, 'the law and the Government' will be crushed if you now do this. In my opinion you will only be following, though late, an example set to you not only by other great and wealthy Irish landlords, but by very many men who, though struggling and in difficulties, have felt bound by their position, no matter how great the inconvenience to themselves and their families, to proceed with generosity and furtherance in the exaction of their legal rights,

"I remain, etc.,

"M. E. HICKS BEACH."

"The Marquess of Clanricarde."

Moreover, he was confident that in the settlement of this question the Government would have the sympathy and support of many exalted and influential persons. For instance, the position of the Archbishop of Tuam might be illustrated by a letter which his Lordship sent to *The Times*. The Archbishop in his endeavours to arrange a settlement of the question had several interviews with the agent, to whom he put the following questions:—How much rent would be required all round in view of a settlement; would a certain sum assessed on the tenants according to the value of their holdings be accepted in regard to costs; did he propose to remit or not to enforce the payment of arrears; and, lastly, would he admit all the tenants in the parish and immediate neighbourhood who had asked for the intervention of the Archbishop. The replies were that all tenants restored would be liable to all costs and arrears, even those which had accrued while they were not in possession of the farms; that payment of three years rent and costs would be demanded; that no guarantee would be given that the balance should not be demanded at any time; that the tenants would not be restored generally, but that each case would be considered on its merits; and that all tenants except those against whom legal proceedings were pending could have the same terms. On receipt of those replies the Archbishop of Tuam wrote to *The Times*, asking that the questions and the answers thereto might be published as they showed Lord Clanricarde in his true light as a landlord, and stating that he had made many attempts to effect a settlement of agrarian disputes in the district, and that these replies showed the spirit in which his efforts had been seconded. I will now read for the House the Archbishop's letter—

"Sir.—A short time ago a large number of Lord Clanricarde's tenants signed a document in which they requested me to mediate for them with a view of procuring their restoration to their homes and farms on the best terms I could secure from the agent. I therefore submitted four written questions to the agent, Mr. Tener, and afterwards I had an interview with him at the bank of Portumna. I request you will be good enough to publish my questions and the answers given by Mr. Tener. They were taken down to-day verbatim by the bank manager in the presence of the county Inspector, Mr. O'Brien and myself. After the document was written and copied, Mr. Tener added that in some cases he would take two instead of three years rents as one of the conditions of retaining or returning to the farms.

"This document speaks for itself and shows Clanricarde in his true light as a landlord. Observe for instance that Mr. Tener would require payment of rent even for the time that the evicted tenants were not in possession of lands or houses at all, when in many cases Mr. Tener's emergency men had carried off the crops of the tenants and had grazed the landlord's cattle on those evicted farms. It is well known that I have always disapproved of the plan of campaign and that I have always counselled my flock here in Portumna and elsewhere to respect the law and abstain from every kind of outrage. I have made several attempts to effect a settlement of the agrarian dispute in this district. This document of Mr. Tener's shows the spirit in which my efforts have been seconded. I think before God and man I am justified in declining to open my lips on this subject in future and let those who are responsible for this state of things bear the consequences.

"Yours, etc.,
"John Healy, D.D.,
"Coadjutor Bishop of Clonfert,
"Palmerstown House Portumna,
"County Galway."

January 28th, 1891.

There was also considerable correspondence between the Archbishop and Sir West Ridgeway, the then Under-Secretary, from which it was evident that the Under-Secretary was sympathetic on this question. He submitted that the Act had failed entirely to deal with such cases as that of Lord Clanricarde, and that the only remedy was compulsory powers. He felt the sufferings and the plight of these evicted tenants so keenly that he would adopt any method or weapon the use of which might suggest itself to him as a means calculated to bring about their restoration to their old homes. The Act could not succeed in its great object of establishing permanent peace in Ireland while it left this question in its present unsettled condition. That being so, how could the British Government expect the Irish people to be loyal, and how could those who had been identified with the land struggle for the last thirty years and had been closely connected with the evicted tenants, be satisfied with an Act from the operation of which the men who had risked and lost everything were practically excluded? There would never be peace or contentment in Ireland until justice was done to the evicted tenants. He begged to second the Motion

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House learns with the deepest concern that the expectations held out by Ministers during the debates on the Land Act of 1903 in reference to the reinstatement of Evicted Tenants in

Ireland have been disappointed; and is of opinion that the powers given to the Estates Commissioners by the Act of 1903 should be without further delay put into active operation so as to determine whether further legislation is required to achieve an object admitted by the Irish Government to be of vital importance for the peace and contentment of Ireland."—(*Mr. Kendal O'Brien.*)

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) said he desired to express the view of the landlords with reference to the general question dealt with in this Resolution. In the two speeches just delivered, though there had not been any general attack on the landlords, or any general statement of their position, it might be inferred that the landlords had done something to prevent the Act operating as favourably to the evicted tenants as it might have done. He ventured to say that that was not the case. At the present time the landlords had no animosity whatsoever towards the evicted tenants. Years ago, when the land war was being carried on, there undoubtedly was animosity; to claim that there was not would be to claim for the landlords an almost angelic disposition, and he did not know that he was bound to make any such claim for them. There was admittedly a war going on between landlords and tenants, and neither party looked with any great favour on the other. The landlords regarded the evicted tenants as the main champions of a cause to which they objected, and which if successful was likely to lead to their ruin, and naturally they had an animosity against them. But the years which had passed had obliterated that feeling from the minds of the landlords. ["Clanricarde."] Everyone would admit that the Clanricarde was a special case; he was speaking of the landlords as a body. They had one interest which, doubtless, hon. Members opposite would in their hearts approve. Hon. Members sometimes expressed their determination to support their soldiers who had been wounded in the struggle. The landlords, too, had their wounded soldiers—those who were placed in occupation of the vacant farms, and they intended to see that no injustice was done to them. If the landlords deserted their "wounded soldiers" at the present time they would be blamed by nobody more than by hon. Members opposite. That was really the interest of the landlords in this question, and they had no animosity against the evicted tenants. Nevertheless, they had the firmest intention of standing by those tenants who came forward to their assistance in their struggle. It was admitted that when the Land Bill was before the House that these tenants could not be dispossessed, because that would only be creating another cause of strife in Ireland. The landlords held that view very strongly, and in so doing, they were holding a view which would be approved of by hon. Gentlemen opposite.

The hon. Member for East Galway had dealt with the case of Lord Clanricarde, but he did not intend going into that case. [NATIONALIST cries of "Hear, hear!"] He had never defended the action of Lord Clanricarde, but nobody would contend that every landlord in Ireland was a good landlord; and, on the other hand, hon. Gentlemen opposite would not hold that every tenant in Ireland was a good tenant. When the Land Bill was before the House a proposal was made to insert clauses in the Bill, because they wanted this question of the evicted tenants settled. They admitted the great difficulty of dealing with this question, and that difficulty was to find the land upon which to place the evicted tenants, because they could not oust those who were actually in possession of the land from which the other tenants had been evicted. He had not yet heard any suggestion as to how the Act could be amended to meet this difficulty. To his mind the Land Act had not yet been long enough in operation to enable them to judge. They did not know how it would operate after it had been in force some considerable time, and to hurry it on too much would be detrimental to the cause which hon. Gentlemen opposite had at heart. If there happened to be too much favouritism they might stop the sales on the part of landlords, and he was sure that even Nationalist Members did not want that. He had only risen for the purpose of stating the real position of the landlords towards the evicted tenants.

He assured the House that the landlords had no animosity towards them, but they were determined that those tenants who came forward to assist them in time of need should not be injured by any action on their part.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he rose for the purpose of putting to the Attorney-General certain practical considerations and certain questions. He would not dwell upon the importance and urgency of the question. It was a matter of common agreement amongst all sections of the House when the Bill was passed that there could be no settlement of the Irish land question, no ending of the Irish land war, which did not provide for the reinstatement of the evicted tenants in Ireland. Even in the House of Lords, when Lord Barrymore took some exception to the evicted tenants' clauses, he was answered by Lord Lansdowne, on behalf of the Government, who said that the provisions dealing with evicted tenants were an essential portion of the scheme, and that without that it would be impossible to hope for any great settlement of the Irish land question. Had the Act been successful so far in its working? The hon. Member opposite said the Act had not been long enough in operation, but, with great respect, he submitted that that was nonsense. It had been in operation for a year and a half, and they must judge of the success of the Act by what had happened. The difficulty the Nationalists were in was that they had no information on the question. He made, in the first place, a serious complaint of the fact that information was being deliberately withheld from them and from the House as to how the Act was working. When the Bill was under discussion they were promised that there should be periodical Reports by the Estates Commissioners. They had had no Report whatever. Last May an Interim Report was issued, but it gave them no practical information as to what was being done with reference to the evicted tenants. When they had asked for information they were told that a Report would be issued shortly giving information up to December 31st; but at the present moment they were without any information whatever as to how the Act was working, and they were denied the information when they asked for it across the floor of the House.

They had asked for information upon two most essential and vital questions. One was with reference to the regulations, instructions, and orders which had been issued by the Government to the Estates Commissioners as to the working of the evicted tenants clauses of the Land Act. Enormous powers were placed in the Estates Commissioners' hands to deal with evicted tenants under the Land Act, and those powers ought to have enabled them to have advanced the evicted tenants' question very near to a settlement. The other day the hon. Member for East Mayo asked for information as to the number of evicted tenants, the names of the estates from which they had been evicted, whether the tenants had been reinstated on the farms from which they had been evicted, or provided with new farms, etc. What was the answer he got, on the eve of the debate, on this question, when no Report had been put in the hands of the House? The Attorney-General said a Report would be issued shortly of the proceedings of the Commission up to December 31st last, but that pending the publication of the Report the Government was not prepared to impose on the Commissioners the preparation of a supplementary Return. Was this refusal to impose these labours on the Commissioners due to any representation from the Commissioners protesting against these labours being put upon them? If they had not refused, he hoped the Attorney-General would let the House know, in justice to them, that the refusal to give the information was not due to any protest on their part. When the Attorney-General refused to give the information he (Mr. Redmond) pressed the matter. The right hon. and learned Gentleman then telegraphed and got some of the information. Would the House allow him to read the extraordinary figures with which he had been supplied. The Act had been in operation a year and a half. The Commissioners had enormous powers. Everybody knew that their most urgent and pressing duty was to endeavour to grapple with the evicted tenants' question. And what did they find? The number of applications received by the Estates Commissioners from persons claiming to be reinstated was 4,550. The total number of evicted tenants reinstated by the Commissioners was forty-six. The total number of evicted tenants reinstated by landlords was ninety-one. That was about 130 evicted tenants had been restored under the Act of 1891, either by the Commissioners or landlords themselves, out of a total of 4,550. He asserted, therefore, that the Act had been in this respect a complete failure. Why was it? Was it the fault of the Commissioners? He did not know; he asked for information.

A question was asked the other day as to whether any regulations, orders, or instructions had been issued by the Executive Government to the Commissioners with reference to the exercise of their power to restore evicted tenants, and the Attorney-General replied that nothing that could be properly called regulations had been issued, but that there had been correspondence upon the subject which was confidential. He asked further whether that correspondence contained orders or instructions, and the right hon. Gentleman did not deny it. He claimed they were entitled to information as to these orders and instructions. They could not criticise the action of the Commissioners unless they knew what they were. It was possible that these gentlemen had been behaving in a negligent and improper manner. On the other hand, they might be most anxious to carry out their duties and have been hampered and prevented by instructions from the Government. He believed the Act could be accelerated if the Commissioners were to inquire into the circumstances of the evicted tenants, and see if the landlords were willing to sell. If they were not willing, then it should be the duty of the Commissioners to find farms for the tenants elsewhere. Had this initiative been set in motion, or were the Commissioners declining to consider any case of evicted tenants except when the estate on which they were was being sold, and, if they were declining, was it due to their own desire or was it prompted by the Government? In consequence of the delay which had marked the working of inquiry into the case of the evicted tenants in the past the United Irish League felt itself bound to take very vigorous action. They sent inspectors to every district of Ireland to make inquiries, and they had obtained information from North-East Cork, North and South Louth, North Tipperary, Limerick, and Clare, which they had sent to the Estates Commissioners. In reply they had received a letter stating that local inquiries would be made as soon as possible into the circumstances of each case by inspectors who would report. That was a most satisfactory letter, because it showed that the Commissioners were willing to investigate any cases sent to them. Was that practice still going on? Were the inspectors going through the country and making investigation? He was informed that they were not. He wished to know why. What had happened? Had any orders been given to the Commissioners to change their practice? He noticed that some of the Unionist Members raised an outcry because the secretary of the Estates Commissioners wrote a similar letter to the United Irish League. That was, of course, an unpardonable crime in the eyes of some people, and he was not sure that the unfortunate secretary who sent it would not be called upon to resign. He did not denounce the Act as incapable of settling the evicted tenants' question, but all he wished for now was information.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) confessed that the complaint of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford at not having information was to a great degree well founded. It was much to be regretted that the Report of the Estates Commissioners was not published at an earlier date so as to be available for this debate. Though the hon. Member's information was scanty it was almost as full as his own. He would give the House all the information in his power to enable hon. Members to form a conclusion upon the Motion that had been made. He would endeavour to point out what was the problem they had to deal with. Looking to the state of the evicted tenant question in Ireland at present, he did not at all think they could assume that the 4,550 applications from all over the country were all genuine. He thought it was most unfair to contrast the number of applications that came from the whole of Ireland with the sales which had taken place in the small portion of the country where the Land Act had come into operation, and to say that because these applications had not been dealt with the Act was therefore a failure. They were dealing in the one case with all the evicted tenants who were sending in applications from the whole of Ireland, and they were dealing in the other case with a small portion of the land. This was, so far as he could ascertain, how matters stood. The evicted tenants to be dealt with were those connected with the seventeen estates known as the "Plan of Campaign" estates, on which combinations against the payment of rent had been entered into. The total number of evicted holdings on these estates in February, 1893, when the Matthew Commission inquired into the subject, was 1,350. The old tenants were reinstated in 414 cases, and new tenants were settled with the old tenants in fifteen cases, making together 429. There were in the hands of "planters" as purchasers twenty, in all 235 holdings held by 102 new tenants. There were also in the hands of landlords, land corporations, and similar bodies 482 holdings, and there were lying derelict 204. In May, 1903, the information given under the above heads was brought down to date, and the following state of things was disclosed. The number of evicted tenants on the seventeen estates had increased from 1,350 to 1,451; the number of holdings reoccupied by the old tenants and by new tenants with the approval of the old tenants had increased from 429 to 1,082; the number of holdings occupied by new tenants had increased from 235 to 288; and the number of derelict farms had decreased from 204 to sixteen. That showed, he thought, very satisfactory progress in the economical arrangement of things on these estates.

In reference to evicted farms in Ireland generally, matters stood thus. Unfortunately, there were no statistics which went further back than January 1st, 1889, but on that date the total number of such farms throughout Ireland which were unlet was 2,750. Of these 1,405 were lying derelict, and the remainder, 1,345, were either cultivated by the landlords or the land corporations. Between 1889 and 1894 there was an increase in these figures, the total number of unlet evicted farms having risen to 3,582, of which 2,067 were in the hands of landlords and land corporations, while 1,515 were derelict. But since 1894 there had been a continuous and progressive decrease, both in respect of the total number of unlet evicted farms and of the number lying derelict. On January 1st, 1905, the number of evicted farms unlet had dropped to 1,616, a reduction of 54 per cent. as compared with 1894. The derelict farms had fallen in the same period from 1,515 to 625. The area of the latter was 22,365 acres, which bore to the entire cultivable area of Ireland the proportion of 1 to 681 acres. He thought it was a happy thing that Parties on all sides could congratulate themselves that steady progress was being made in arranging these matters in a way to meet the wants and wishes of the persons concerned. It was interesting to see what had been done during the years 1901 to 1904 in respect to evictions and reinstatements. In 1901 there were 314 evictions and 211 reinstatements, so that really the balance that remained outstanding was very small. In 1902 the number of evictions was 288, and the number of reinstatements 280; in 1903 the number of evictions was 319, and the number of reinstatements was 242; and in 1904 the number of evictions was 226, and the number of reinstatements was 203. [AN HON. MEMBER: How many farms were let on the eleven months system?] He could not tell at present, but probably he would be able to give the information later on. It was quite true, as the Member for Waterford had said, that the number of applications made to the Estates Commissioners since the Act came into operation in November, 1903, was 4,550. Of those 106 were outside the Act altogether, inasmuch as the eviction took place more than twenty-five years ago. Of 130 others, eighty-six of the applicants were in America, five in Australia, one in Africa, and forty-one in Great Britain. Of those evicted farms 3,156 were in the occupation of tenants commonly called planters; of 1,394 which were in the hands of landlords many of them were let for grazing. In 210 cases where lands were let to graziers the Estates Commissioners solicited landlords to sell those holdings separately from their estates for the purpose of facilitating reinstatement. The landlords objected to do that. They were quite willing to put no difficulty in the way of reinstating tenants where lands from which those tenants had been evicted were in the landlords' hands or in the hands of grazing tenants. But they had refused—and, in his opinion, rightly and justly refused—to evict the planters who did not desire to go.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Have the Estates Commissioners discontinued the practice of asking landlords to sell separately?

Mr. ATKINSON said he would come to that in due order. In dealing with applications inspectors were directed to go down to each estate. They were supplied with a list of all the tenants who had been evicted from the estate inspected, and they were directed to supply to the Estates Commissioners all the information they could in reference to those evicted tenants, their condition of life, and the possibility of reinstatement. If the estate contained untenanted land, they also got further a list of tenants evicted from estates other than those sold with instructions to inquire into the condition of those tenants and recommend such of them as might be desirable to plant upon the untenanted land that had been so acquired. In the sales of estates direct from landlord to tenant the Commissioners endeavoured, with the consent of the owner, to arrange for reinstatement, and in each such case to make grants of money to enable the reinstated tenant to build and stock his farm. In sales to the Commissioners direct they reinstated the evicted tenants on their previous holdings where possible, and endeavoured, if they could not reinstate them on their previous holdings, to put them in positions on some other land, whether on that estate or on untenanted land which they might had purchased in different parts. Now they had reinstated forty-six tenants, and they had got grants of money which they would never have to repay, and which did not add to the price of the farms, amounting to £3,311. Where possible they reinstated on the farm from which a man had been evicted, and when that was not possible, if they had any untenanted land which they had obtained by separate purchase they put the evicted tenant on that portion, giving preference, of course, to those who came from the immediate locality.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): Is this the practice of the Commission or the orders of the Castle.

Mr. ATKINSON: This is the practice of the Commission.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Is the practice founded on a rule or a regulation?

Mr. ATKINSON: I will deal with that when I come to it.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: Is it their own account or their practice?

Mr. ATKINSON said it was their practice. The principle on which they dealt with the matter was this. On the sale of any estate they reinstated the tenants evicted from that estate. On a "Plan of Campaign" estate, and such others where the question was in a more acute stage, the landlords were approached confidentially by the Commissioners to endeavour to arrive at some arrangement for the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. As a general rule, where ordinary estates were sold they did not approach the tenants previously to the negotiation for the sale of the estate. They also endeavoured to obtain untenanted land wherever possible, and the first purpose to which they devoted it was enlarging uneconomic holdings; the second, the reinstatement of evicted tenants, the preference being given to the tenants in the neighbourhood. Those were the principles on which they acted.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Has that been the practice all through? Was it not the practice to initiate proceedings on other than the "campaign" estates?

Mr. ATKINSON: said that, so far as his information went, that was so. The Commissioners endeavoured to obtain untenanted land wherever it could be got, first, to increase the size of the uneconomic holdings, and secondly, to reinstate the evicted tenants. If the hon. Gentleman would refer to the sections of the Act he would see that it was only upon a sale that their power of reinstating began. They could not reinstate until there was a sale of an estate.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Does not that apply to the "Campaign" estates also?

MR. ATKINSON said that no doubt it would, but the only way they could get land was by buying untenanted land or waiting until the sale of an estate was effected. It was quite possible to take the initiative if so desired, and they did take the initiative in the congested districts where the matter was more acute, and where it was more desirable to put an end to the unpleasant feelings that existed in the locality. [AN HON. MEMBER: Have they done it on Lord Lansdowne's estate?] He could not answer as to whether they had done it on any particular estate. It appeared that the number of actual reinstatements which had taken place was ninety-one by the landlords and forty-six by the Land Commission. There were, he was happy to say, sixty-seven others who, it was hoped, would be reinstated in a very short time, but the arrangements were not yet complete. The figures he was about to give would show how really unfair it was to test the working of the Act by what had occurred in the very short period since it came into operation in November, 1903. The Commissioners had acquired by purchase 6,076 acres of untenanted land; they had offers made to purchase 7,663 acres and negotiations were pending in respect of a very large tract indeed—28,063 acres. So that if those negotiations were successfully carried through they would have 41,802 acres of untenanted land to operate upon. And it was but reasonable to suppose that the process of reinstatement would go on at a much more rapid rate in the future than it had proceeded at up to the present time. That was shortly the condition of the problem, the statistics showing how matters stood, the practice adopted by the Commissioners in dealing with it, and the principles upon which they acted. The Motion stated that there had been disappointment caused by the representations of those in charge of the Bill not having been carried out. He did not think that really there was any foundation for that statement, because it never was represented that the Estates Commissioners could secure the reinstatement of tenants unless the estates were sold, or unless untenanted land was procured, and that had been the rule up to this. He would recall to the hon. Gentleman's recollection an answer given by his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary. The question put to him was: "Can the Estates Commissioners make any advance for the purpose of compensating a tenant for leaving his holding." He replied—

> "That raises several issues which in reality are distinct. In the case of a holding forming part of an estate which is not purchased or proposed to be purchased, no advance can be made. Such a case is outside the scope of the 12th Section of the Act. In the case of a holding forming part of an estate purchased or proposed to be purchased compensation may be paid under Sections 12 and 13 for the benefit or improvement of that estate or generally for the purposes of this Act one of which is the restoration of the evicted tenants."

So that when there was no sale of an estate there could be no reinstatement, unless there was untenanted land to be offered for the purpose. The only other question which the hon. Gentleman put to him was, "What regulations have been made for the Estates Commissioners?"

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he asked what instructions had been given.

MR. ATKINSON said he was not laying stress on particular words. Those hon. Members who pressed this question too strongly seemed to forget what had occurred when the Act was passed through the House. The 23rd Section, Sub-section 8, of the Act provided that the Commissioners in carrying out the foregoing provisions of the Act should be under the general control of the Lord-Lieutenant, and should act in accordance with such regulations as might be made by him from time to time. It had been suggested in Committee that these regulations should be printed and laid on the Table of the House. That suggestion was immediately objected to, and accordingly it was not pressed, and the Act passed without any provision stating that the regulations guiding the Commissioners should be laid on the Table of the House?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: They were promised to us, in answer to a question put by myself.

MR. ATKINSON: Promised to be laid on the Table of the House?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Yes.

MR. ATKINSON: I am surprised, for my recollection does not agree with the hon. Member's.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: My recollection agrees with that of the hon. Member for South Tyrone. Will the hon. and learned Gentleman quote from *Hansard* the passage showing whether the claim was made by us and objected to by the Government?

MR. ATKINSON: I remember now the suggestion being made on the Report stage, and that I saw no objection. But an objection was raised, and the provision was purposely omitted from the Bill.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said he remembered the circumstances perfectly well. The discussion took the shape that he and his hon. friends pressed for the regulations to be laid on the Table. The Government declined to put them in the Bill, but they absolutely promised that the regulations should be open to Members and laid on the Table.

MR. ATKINSON said that this was not his recollection, and he was very much surprised that if hon. Members desired the regulations to be laid on the Table they should have been willing to rest content with an assurance instead of insisting that it should be put in the Bill. The Estates Commissioners were in the same position as other executive officers of the Government. It was insisted again and again during the progress of the Bill that they should not be put in an independent position without the control of the Government and taking their own view as to the course they ought to pursue, but that they should be under the control of the Government, to obey the orders of the Government. If that was so he was unable to see why communications that passed between the Government and them should be disclosed when they were not disclosed in other cases.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Our whole contention was that these gentlemen should not be judicial officers, that their proceedings should be open for the discussion and control of the House. We never thought of the Government.

MR. ATKINSON said he did not contend that their proceedings should not be under the control of the House in the same way as the action of any Executive Government should be controlled. He meant in the sense that their action could be discussed here, and the member of the Government here be made responsible. But he contended that being officers of the Government, and the House having deliberately said that the regulations should not be laid on the Table, the House was no more entitled to have communications passing between them and the Government laid before it than in the case of communications between the Government and the Inspector-General of Police. No formal regulations had been made; but he was informed that communications had passed between his right hon. friend the Member for Dover and the Commissioners, not of a formal character, but such communications as would pass between the Government and executive officers. It would be quite unreasonable to require that these officers should be judged by what they did when they were responsible to the Government, and therefore the Government was responsible to Parliament. If they were in a judicial position the Government would not have that responsibility. It was just because they were in a dependent position, bound to act upon orders they received, that the Government was responsible and should be censured when they did wrong. That was the position. It would be unreasonable to require that confidential communications passing between the Government and executive officers should be laid on the Table of the House.

MR. JOHN MORLEY asked what was the use of the right hon. and learned Gentleman telling the House that these Estates Commissioners were under the control of the Executive, and under the control indirectly of the House of Commons, when the House was not in possession of the Report of the proceedings of these Estates Commissioners on the part of the transactions in which the House took the greatest interest? The right hon. and learned Gentleman had, he would not say wrangled, but had had a dispute with the hon. Members for South Tyrone and Waterford as to whether it was understood that these regulations, directions, or instructions were or were not to be within the cognisance of Parliament, and he said hon. Members had forgotten the proceedings during the passage of the Act; but the right hon. and learned Gentleman might be reminded of the language used by Lord Lansdowne in another place when an Amendment was moved by a Conservative Peer who was an opponent of the Bill. In rebutting the proposal of the noble Lord, Lord Lansdowne said, upon the point whether planters would be intimidated or not, that there need be no fear of intimidation or oppression, because all the proceedings would first of all be under the control of the Land Commissioners, and, secondly, the Estates Commissioners would be under the control and supervision of the Irish Government, who would certainly have something to say, and if the Irish Government did not put a check on such proceedings, no doubt attention would be drawn to the matter in Parliament. But what was the use of drawing attention to the matter in Parliament if Members were met by the Irish Government, or what remained of the wreck of the Irish Government, with the statement that the regulations or instructions were in the nature of private or informal communications? What were they about, these communications which were withdrawn from the cognisance of Parliament? They had never been presented, and they were now discussing these three sections of the Act of 1903 without knowing the facts, which were vital. This was a regular illustration of the way in which the Government of Ireland was carried on. In the House, both sides, with the best intentions towards Ireland, united in passing an Act for the benefit of Ireland, and, as had been said a hundred times of such Acts, when it crossed the Channel and went to the Castle or the Courts the whole intention of Parliament was balked and frustrated. How could they get over that?

He had listened with the keenest interest to the right hon. Gentleman's figures, more especially for the reason that he himself was responsible ten or eleven years ago for an elaborate attempt to settle this enormous mischief in Ireland. But what was the use of reading out to the House figures which they could not check, and which they could barely follow? Why were not those figures given to them at a time and in a shape in which they would really be of use to the House in forming a judgment on these proceedings? [AN HON. MEMBER on the IRISH Benches: "They do not want that."] The hon. and learned Member for Hackney talked about the landlords being as well justified as hon. Gentlemen below the gangway in defending their soldiers, the planters. He for one had never denied that. The measure for which he was responsible safeguarded the interests of the planters as much as any measure that could be brought in by hon. Gentlemen opposite. The hon. and learned Gentleman read a passage from a speech of his which showed that he was under obligation to the Irish Members, but that he and his Government were not at all afraid of saying that they would be no parties to any injustice to the planters. Had the right hon. and learned Gentleman presented to the House in any way any case as it stood? The Government had admitted that this was a case of the utmost importance for the social well-being of Ireland; but the right hon. Gentleman had not given them any material whatever for forming a judgment as to how far the intention of Parliament in the Act of 1903 had been carried out. Moreover, the right hon. and learned Gentleman had evaded another point raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Waterford. Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman deny that the clauses for the reinstatement of evicted tenants were one of the great objects of the Act of 1903?

MR. ATKINSON: I admit it.

MR. JOHN MORLEY said it was on that very account very expressly stated; and although it was admitted by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, as well as by Lord Lansdowne, that that was the central object of that legislation, yet they now found Gentlemen from Ireland drawing the attention of Parliament to the fact that that central object was practically a failure. He thought the right hon. and learned Gentleman would not deny from these wretched, starved, meagre figures he had produced, that that part of the policy of the Act had been practically a failure.

What was the explanation? The explanation given in Ireland was that instructions were given from Dublin Castle to the Estates Commissioners which curtailed their freedom of action. He had listened with the greatest care to the right hon. and learned Gentleman, but he had not the least idea whether that was a true charge or not. If it was a sound charge, if there was a basis for it, if it was in consequence of any instruction from the Executive Government to the Estates Commissioners that that important part of the Act of 1903 was practically a failure, then the Government had added one more to the long list of Executive failures in Ireland—a most serious failure, a failure which would bring plenty of trouble to those who, at some future date, would become responsible for peace and order in Ireland. He had listened with satisfaction to the right hon. Gentleman's figures as to the reduction in the number of derelict farms, and to all those other statistics with which those who had been responsible for Irish government were only too familiar. But so long as the evicted tenants were not reinstated, or transferred to other farms, so long would there remain an open sore, and it would be impossible for any Irish Government to think that they had solved one of the central difficulties in the Irish situation. It was idle to test the operation of the Act by figures given to them across the Table, and, therefore, he should, with great confidence, support the Motion. He believed that the hon. Gentleman had discovered a great mischief in Irish administration. Was this the ordinary case where the intention of Parliament had been baffled by the operation of the law-room in Dublin Castle? If not, he presumed the lawyers were consulted. If they were not consulted, then the Chief Secretary, the Irish Government, acted on the construction of the sections of an Act of Parliament without taking legal opinion upon them. The whole thing exposed once more the imposture of this Parliament passing an Act for the benefit of Ireland and then, once passed, its administration, its operation, passing entirely out of any effective supervision of that House.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said that this, though a very quiet debate in regard to Ireland, had been very instructive. He did not think any speech made that evening had been more instructive than that of the Attorney-General for Ireland. He wished, however, to make this preliminary observation, that every single Irish Member who had spoken from those benches had declared that if they had had their choice between accepting the Land Bill and abandoning the evicted tenants they would rather have rejected the Land Bill than have deserted the evicted tenants. Indeed, that was practically the point of view of every section in the House. The hon. Gentleman who spoke on behalf of the landlords of Ireland—he hoped the hon. Member did not include Lord Clanricarde among his clients—said that the landlords of Ireland had no objection whatever to the reinstatement of the evicted tenants; and, far beyond that was the reiterated assertion of every supporter of the Government. The statement had been made over and over again that the restoration of the evicted tenants was an essential, vital, and supreme part of the Land Act, and, as a matter of fact, the Bill would never have received the cordial and active support it had done from all parts of the House, if the House had not been convinced that they were dealing with a measure which would finally settle this great and vexed question. Here was the situation. They had the Ministry, the Opposition and the Irish Members; they had the House of Commons and the House of Lords all agreed in the desire and hope and certainty that the evicted tenants were going to be restored, and then they had Dublin

Castle defeating the whole intention of Parliament. That was the case in a nutshell. The House could understand how Sir Antony MacDonnell found that state of things a little unsatisfactory, and why the late Chief Secretary should have called in the aid of a strong man like Sir Antony MacDonnell to deal with Dublin Castle. The Attorney-General for Ireland had read out a list of the applications made for reinstatement. Some of them came from people in America, and some from people in Great Britain. Did the hon. and learned Gentleman make a point of that?

Mr. ATKINSON: I merely stated the fact.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said he would make a point of it, and it was this. He went up and down amongst his countrymen in Great Britain, and many and many a time he had been grieved to find a man wandering in search of work in Liverpool or Glasgow, glad to take the worst and the lowest paid job he could get—employment in gasworks or in chemical works. Such a man, he learned, had an evicted farm in Ireland, and was hoping year after year that he might be restored to it. Was there a single man with a particle of the sense of humanity in him who ought not to rejoice that an Act of Parliament had been passed which was meant to bring such people back from their exile to their native homes. If such could be accomplished, would not every country benefit—Ireland by regaining her lost population, and England by changing enmity into friendship. Therefore, the case was strengthened in favour of the rapid, prompt, and courageous work of the restoration of the evicted tenants. What had been the result? Only 131 evicted tenants had been restored to their holdings. The right hon. Gentleman the Attorney-General was entitled to say that of the 4,550 applications some of them were absurd, some of them out of date, and some of them bogus; but it was a miserable result that only 131 had been restored, out of 4,550 applications. They all knew the cause. The Attorney-General might disclaim responsibility on the part of the Law Officers. He knew nothing about it; but it might be that the right hon. Gentleman had joined his powerful voice to the voice of reaction, which had resulted in the resignation of the late Chief Secretary. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was about to join the reactionaries in connection with the evicted tenants also. Certainly the question would have advanced more rapidly were it not for Dublin Castle. What was the answer of the Attorney-General? He said that the Estates Commissioners were merely executive officers, and must, therefore, act under the control of the Government generally, the Government being responsible to this House. He accepted that; but what was the right hon. Gentleman's next position? It was that the Government, who were responsible to this House, were not bound to give the House material for forming a judgment; and the right hon. Gentleman was daring enough to say that the House of Commons had no right to get information as to the action and instructions of the Government in this matter.

Mr. ATKINSON said he regretted very much that the Report was not in the hands of Members. The House, however, was not entitled to get confidential communications which the Government might have issued.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said the position, then, was that the House was not entitled to get the instructions which were issued under the sections of the Act in order that the will of Parliament might be carried out. Was ever a more monstrous proposition laid down? The right hon. Gentleman had evaded the point. He did not complain that the Estates Commissioners had not sent in their Report. His complaint was that the House of Commons was not supplied, and that the Attorney-General dared to tell the House it would not be supplied, with the instructions given to the Estates Commissioners by the Government. He never heard such an extraordinary doctrine laid down in the House of Commons. [An Hon. Member laughed.] He did not know why he excited the hilarity of the Scotch Gentleman opposite, who so eloquently but silently represented his constituency. He dared say that the feeling he showed in this matter did not commend itself to the hon. Gentleman, but he should be obliged if instead of inarticulate interruption the hon. Gentleman got up and answered him. Here were the Estates Commissioners entrusted with the restoration of the evicted tenants; and he had not the smallest doubt but that they were anxious to carry out their work. But they were impeded in their work; and when he asked what instructions were given to them the answer of the Attorney-General was that they were confidential communications. It was another glimpse into the manner in which Ireland was governed. As his right hon. friend had said the House might pass any Act it liked, every section of the House might desire to do justice to and confer benefits on Ireland, they might want to close up a running sore in Irish life, but Dublin Castle stood there to defeat them, and the right hon. Gentleman was prepared by means of an unconstitutional and absurd doctrine to prevent the House of Commons from seeing the inner springs of action by which the best intentions of Parliament had been frustrated.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL said he wished to put a plain, categorical question to the Attorney-General. Here was an Act of Parliament, one of the greatest measures passed by this House, but one of the most complicated and difficult to administer. Did the right hon. Gentleman tell the House of Commons that the Estates Commissioners could administer that Act without a set of rules, regulations, and instructions. Did he mean to convey that the Chief Secretary or the Lord-Lieutenant were to address private letters to public officials, giving them direction as to the manner in which the Act was to be administered, for the purpose of burking the control of Parliament? He asked the right hon. Gentleman deliberately if a set of rules had not been sanctioned by the Lord-Lieutenant.

Mr. ATKINSON said as far as he was aware no such instructions had been issued.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL said he would put the question again; and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to get the information. He sympathised with the right hon. Gentleman because he had very little information on any subject. He further wanted to know were the Estates Commissioners to blame for the Report not having been ready for presentation to the House? Was it not a fact known to everyone that the general work of the Commission, the purchase and sale of ordinary estates, had been slowed down for lack of money? That was well known. It was also well known that another important duty of the Estates Commissioners, namely the sale and purchase of towns, was also slowed down. Had the machinery also been stopped in regard to the evicted tenants? Would the right hon. Gentleman tell the House now if the inspectors were at work in Ireland on the question of the evicted tenants?

Mr. ATKINSON said he understood so.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL said the reply of the right hon. Gentleman did not imply that he had any information he could give to the House. Supposing he himself said that he understood they were not.

Mr. ATKINSON said he should contradict that.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL said he was not very sure that he would not be able to contradict the right hon. Gentleman. Were the inspectors at work, and, if so, how many? There was plenty of money and plenty of inspectors, yet only the magnificent total of forty-six tenants had been restored to their holdings. Parliament was in earnest or it was not when it passed the Bill. If they made a mistake at all it was in trusting too much to the speeches of the late Chief Secretary and in not thinking a great deal more of the Bill. Everyone knew, the right hon. Gentleman knew, that this burning question must be dealt with and this running sore healed and stopped; yet only forty-six tenants were restored to their holdings after eighteen months work, although the funds were sufficient to have dealt with nearly all the evicted tenants. No one had made any charge against the landlords of being unwilling to restore the evicted tenants. That was not the case now. He knew a case in his own constituency where a man was evicted not for the non-payment of rent, but because in the struggle for the representation of Tyrone he voted against one of the Hamiltons. The widow of that man was still living, and had kept an eye on the farm. She claimed to be restored. Did the landlord object? Not a bit of it. He did his level best to get her back, but the hitch was in Dublin Castle, and in the instructions of the Government. It was not the landlords who were blocking the way. He took no account of the Clanricardes or the Lewises. No one would expect them to facilitate affairs in Ireland. They would only act when they were compelled. The majority of the landlords, however, were now only concerned in getting as much money as they could. It was Dublin Castle that was standing in the way of the evicted tenants; and it was a great pity that the Attorney-General was in the position he was and not able to give the House any information. He hoped that the Report, when it was issued, would not be a mere column of figures. He hoped it would be a Report dealing with the working of the Act, and giving a picture of what was going on during the last eighteen months. Why such hesitation in presenting the Report? He entirely agreed with his right hon. friend the Member for Montrose Burghs that one lived and learned in Ireland. One thing was borne in upon him. He had never doubted the intention or capacity of this House, though he might be wrong. He had seen great Acts of Parliament passed and sent across to Dublin only to be mauled almost out of existence. All this came from a band of hostile men encamped in Ireland as the real governors of the country; and until that system was taken by the throat and overthrown the best intentions of the House would be brought to nothing by that band of officials, who were not only mercenaries, but overpaid mercenaries as well.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.) said he desired to intervene in the debate because he represented a constituency that contained more evicted tenants than any other constituency in Ireland. The question of the evicted tenants was one of primary importance; and the neglect of it tended not only to impede the progress of the Land Act, but to prolong that state of turmoil and strife which unfortunately existed. When the Land Bill was being passed through the House of Commons it was made abundantly clear that the rights of the evicted tenants would be safeguarded, and that the Estates Commissioners would be clothed with great powers, which would enable them to deal with the question of the evicted tenants in a satisfactory manner. A number of hon. Members on his side, although they held certain views in regard to the Bill, acquiesced in its passing for that very reason. Indeed, the late Chief Secretary expressed the wish that as far as the evicted tenants were concerned landlords and tenants should draw a sponge over the bitter and evil memories of the past. Although the evicted tenants in Ireland were numerically small, still the question was a very large one indeed; and unless an effort were made by the Irish Government to restore these tenants to their holdings, or to give them an equivalent amount of land elsewhere, the Government need not expect anything except turmoil, disturbance, and confusion. Hon. Gentlemen from time to time might have read of disturbances in the Loughrea district; but they were due entirely to the fact that Lord Clanricarde and Mrs. Lewis had absolutely declined to allow the Act to be put into operation. One hundred and twenty-two tenants had filed applications from the Clanricarde Estate with the Estates Commissioners; and twenty-two tenants from the Lewis Estate. There were no complications, as the lands were still derelict. He wished to ask the Government now what they intended to do with reference to the Loughrea district? Were they going to take the matter lying down, were they going to prosecute war against the evicted tenants, or would they try and induce Lord Clanricarde, Mrs. Lewis, and others to enable the evicted tenants to be put back to their holdings.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said the House would excuse him, as the matter was of such importance, if he said that he had looked into this question about the promise of the publication of these regulations, and he found that on July 1st, 1903, a debate took place on the question, and the Chief Secretary used these words:—"He had not yet decided on the exact form of publication, but he agreed that the regulations should come before the House in some way." He would not comment on that, but thought that it should be read.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 182; Noes, 220. (Division List No. 29.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joesph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir FrancisH(Maidstone
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshr.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah

M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, P. J. Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J E B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N. Dorset
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hn, John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir Michael Hicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col H. F (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hn. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredrk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords. N. W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriesshr.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, RtHn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, HC(North'mb Tyneside)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn JG (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col A.C.E. (Taunton
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. ER (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHENT ROOMS).

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to control the arrangements for the Kitchen and Refreshment Room in the Department of the Serjeant at Arms attending this House.

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of seventeen Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of—Mr. James Bailey, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Dalziel, Sir Horatio Davies, Sir Thomas Firbank, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Jacoby, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Lonsdale, Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore, Mr. Pierpoint, Mr. Power, Mr. William Redmond, and Sir Harry Samuel.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

On the Motion for the Adjournment of the House,

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple, asked whether the Government intended to-morrow in any way to interfere so as to prevent the House from giving an opinion, aye or no, on the Motion of the hon. Member for Oldham.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) thought it would have been courteous on the part of the hon. Gentleman to have given him notice of the question. The Government certainly intended to give a decision on that question, and hon. Gentlemen opposite would discover that decision when the time came.

Adjourned at Ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 8th March, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Highland Railway Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

NORWICH UNION LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY [STAMP DUTIES].

Committee to consider of authorising the imposition of a certain Stamp Duty in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Society certain property (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow. (*Mr. Caldwell.*)

PETITIONS.

JUVENILE SMOKING.

Petition from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Poor Law Medical Officers' Association, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (SUNDAY) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Chippenham; and Corsham; to lie upon the Table.

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

Petition of the Mining Association of Great Britain, against; to lie upon the Table.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Ashton-under-Lyne; Chorlton-upon-Hardy; and Cowdenbeath and Lochgelly; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOAN FUND BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Sixty-seventh Annual Report, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

VACCINATION EXPENSES.

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the subject of Vaccination Expenses. Part I. Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

VACCINATION EXPENSES.

Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the subject of Vaccination Expenses, together with Appendix and Index to Evidence. Part II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES (GREAT BRITAIN) (GRANT IN AID).

Copies presented, of (i) Treasury Minute, dated 30th March, 1904; (ii) First Report of the University Colleges Committee, dated 19th December, 1904; (iii) Treasury Minute, dated 28th December, 1904; (iv) Second and Third Reports of the Committee, dated 23rd February, 1905; and (v) Treasury Minute, dated 8th March, 1905, relating to the Grant in Aid of University Colleges, Great Britain [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Blackpool and Garstang Light Railway Order, 1901 (Blackpool and Fylde Light Railway) (Change of name, etc.) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the North Lindsey Light Railways Order, 1900 (North Lindsey Light Railways (Amendment) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Derby, from the Midland Railway Company's (Dore and Chinley) Railway, at or near Hope Station, to Bradwell and Castleton (Hope, Bradwell, and Castleton Light Railway Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Mid Suffolk Light Railway Order, 1900 (Mid Suffolk Light Railway (Halesworth Deviation) Order, 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Middlesex, between Hounslow and Cranford, and between Heston, Hounslow, Hanworth, Twickenham, and Sunbury Cross, being extensions of the existing and authorised undertaking of the London United Tramways (1901) Limited (London United Tramways (Light Railway Extensions) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Southampton and Winchester Great Western Junction Railway (Abandonment) Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158B]; referred to the Committee on the Bill.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Soane's Museum. Copy of Statement of the Funds of the Museum of the late Sir John Soane on January 5th, 1905 [by Act].

County Courts Act, 1888, and Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879. Copy of Order made by the Lord Chancellor, dated February 23rd, 1905, directing that the registrar of the County Court of Warwickshire, held at Birmingham, shall not practise as a solicitor, and that Section 20 of The Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, shall not apply to the office of Registrar of the said County Court [by Act].

IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE) (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).

Return ordered, "relating to Imperial Revenue (Collection and Expenditure) (Great Britain and Ireland) for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1905 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 269, of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. Joseph A. Pease.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Grants to Shipowners for Carrying Boy Sailors.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): To ask the President of the Board of Trade under which Class and Vote of the Estimates has provision been made for the allowance granted to shipowners for carrying boy sailors under Clause 6 of the Merchant Shipping (Mercantile Marine Fund) Act, 1898; and will any arrangement be made, on the cessation of these allowances, to meet the case of boys who have enrolled themselves in the Royal Naval Reserve but are liable to be thrown out of employment and so unable to fulfil their obligations owing to the withdrawal of the grant for their maintenance on board ship.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Provision is made in Sub-head A of Vote 7, Royal Naval Reserves, of the Navy Estimates, for the allowances to shipowners in respect of boy sailors carried under Section 6 of the Merchant Shipping (Mercantile Marine Fund) Act, 1898. The sum provided in the Estimates for 1905–6 is £6,500. On the termination of the statutory limit on March 31st next, the power to pay the allowances in relief of light dues will come to an end, but boys entered under the Act in the "Probationer" class of the Royal Naval Reserve, who comply with the conditions laid down in the regulations, will be eligible for transfer to the "Seaman" class of the Reserve, in accordance with the arrangement with the Admiralty.

Private John Hanley, Leinster Regiment.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he will state the grounds upon which Private John Hanley, No. 2153, of the Leinster Regiment, was discharged the service; and whether, in view of his conduct on and up to discharge and of the fact that this man is now unable to work and subject to periodic attacks of illness contracted whilst serving with the regiment, some bounty or pension will be accorded to him.

(*Answered by Mr. Bromley Davenport.*) This man caught cold about fourteen years ago at Aldershot while on guard in wet weather, and pleurisy and palpitation supervened, which led to his discharge as medically unfit for the service. He had only served three years and 128 days, all at Home, and was therefore awarded a pension of three months for each year's service at sixpence a day, the rate for which he was eligible under the Royal Warrant then in force.

Nationality of Irish Postmasters.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the number of English, Scotch, and Welshmen who have been appointed postmasters in Ireland within the last five years; what are their religious denominations; how many Irishmen have been appointed postmasters in England in the same period: and what are their religious denominations.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) In most cases I have no information as to the nationality of officers in the Post Office, and I consider that it would be undesirable to make inquiry as to their religious denomination. I am unable, therefore, to give the information for which the hon. Member asks.

Postal Arrangements at Glastrigan, County Tipperary.

Mr. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware of the necessity that exists for the establishing of a sub-post office at the village of Glastrigan, in the parish of Kilcommon, North Tipperary, a populous district some six or seven Irish miles distant from a post office or even pillar-box; is he aware that in Glastrigan there is a creamery with two auxiliary depôts, the letters to which establishment alone average eighty weekly; and that there are also three business houses in the village with two schoolhouses adjacent; and, if so, seeing no letter can be despatched from there after 10.15 a.m. each day, he will consider the necessity for providing the locality with better postal arrangements.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I have no information at present as regards the postal requirements of the village of Glastrigan, but I will have inquiry made.

Dismissal of Postal Officials.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General under what regulation or Act of Parliament he exercises the right to dismiss an established officer of long service, entitled to the benefits of the Superannuation Acts, 1884 and 1887, and against whom no direct charge of misconduct is made or proved.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Under my patent of appointment I have full power and authority to appoint and remove such officers as I may think necessary.

Recovery of Forfeited Good-Conduct Stripes by Postmen.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster-General if the rule under which postmen may regain forfeited good-conduct stripes by two years unblemished service is still in operation; and, if not, when it was cancelled, and what are the conditions now obtaining under which lost stripes can be recovered.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The rule is still in operation.

Volunteers in the Post Office—Camp Leave.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster-General if officers of the Department belonging to Volunteer regiments are allowed any special privilege in signing for their period of annual leave over an officer who may have a prior claim by seniority or otherwise to a particular period of the year.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There is no general rule on the subject, but it appears to me reasonable that the periods of leave should be arranged, as far as possible, so as to permit Volunteers to attend camp.

Sick Leave in the Post Office—Case of Mr. Emberson.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a telegraphist named Emberson, at the Central Telegraph Office, London, was attended by the official medical adviser at varying periods during October, November, and December of last year; that it became necessary for him to be sent home before his duty expired on occasions during this period; that, upon resuming after absence from an attack of illness, having been sent off by an official doctor, the chief medical officer sent for him, and reprimanded him for keeping away from work; and that this official stated that no reason existed for his absence, and in consequence a day's pay was deducted; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that the chief medical officer had not attended Emberson previously, and made no examination of him at the time, he will investigate the circumstances of the case.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Mr. Emberson was seen on November 30th by a medical officer of the headquarter staff who reported that Mr. Emberson was suffering from headache, and that he should either resume duty on the following day or obtain a renewal of the sick certificate. Mr. Emberson did neither, but absented himself without leave on December 1st and his pay for the day was rightly stopped, as the chief medical officer was satisfied that he was able to have visited the medical officer on that date.

Publication of Reports of District Commissioners of the Coal Commission.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department will he say when the Reports of the District Commissioners, Parts II.—VIII., of the Royal Commission on Coal Supplies will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) It is hoped that these Reports will be ready for issue about the end of this month.

Poor Law Relief—Percentage of Alien Recipients.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state what is the percentage of aliens who receive Poor Law relief other than medical relief, and what is the percentage of the population as a whole receiving such relief.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The latest figures I have on this subject, so far as aliens are concerned, relate to July 1st, 1903. On that date the proportion which the number of aliens receiving relief other than medical relief only, bore to the total alien population according to the Census of 1901 was ·63 per cent. The percentage of the total population in receipt of such relief on the same date was 2·4.

Disposal of Non-effective Ships.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what are the names of the ships ordered to be built since 1887 which are now reckoned as non-effective; how these ships are to be dealt with immediately; and in what way are they ultimately to be disposed of.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the Returns which have been moved for by the hon. Member for Dundee.

Irish Local Government Board and Newtown Stewart Cottage Scheme.

MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether attention has been called to a recent correspondence between Mr. Michael M'Aleer, of Newtown Stewart, county Tyrone, and the Local Government Board, relative to the representation for a scheme under the Labourers Cottages

Acts, rejected on January 5th last, although a similar scheme had been approved of on a former occasion but had not been proceeded with; if so, whether he can state for what reason the Local Government Board have not, pursuant to the said Acts, directed a local inquiry to be held, and report made, as to the said representations.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The consideration of the representations was adjourned by the council on January 5th as some of the representations were not accompanied by the requisite certificates of the medical officer of health. The Board are at present in correspondence with the council relative to the pending scheme, but as the council have not made default under the Labourers Acts they have no grounds for ordering an inquiry under Section 4 of the Act of 1891. I may add that the councils ot the two Strabane Rural Districts have authorised the building of 173 cottages.

Extension of Pier at Darby's Point, Achill Island.

Dr. AMBROSE: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board, at their meeting in last November, passed a vote for a timber-pile extension of the pier at Darby's Point, Achill Island, and instructed their engineer to draw up plans and submit an estimate; have those plans and the estimate been yet submitted to the Board; if not, will he explain why; and whether, in view of the distress prevailing in Achill Island at present, he will urge on the Board to commence this useful work at once.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The engineering survey has been made and the matter will be further considered by the Board at its next meeting. Employment on this work will consist mainly of skilled labour.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Yacht "Enchantress."

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty can he explain how it is that the Admiralty yacht "Enchantress" has been taken over from the builders although the last instalment of her cost has not been paid; has this been done with the consent of the builder; when is it proposed to pay that last instalment; what has been the average annual cost of coal for the Admiralty yacht during the past three years; and how many days in each of those three years has the Admiralty yacht, whether the "Enchantress" or one of her predecessors, been used by the Lords of the Admiralty.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): This is the procedure adopted in the case of all ships for the Navy. It is not possible to make the final payments until the charges for works left to be done until the ships reach a dockyard have been agreed to. With regard to the second part of the Question: this has been done with the consent of the builder. It is hoped that the last instalment will be paid before the end of this month. The average annual cost of coal for the last three years has been £1,112 Omitting the year 1903, when the old "Enchantress" owing to its condition was not used, the yacht has been used by the Board as follows: 1904, twenty-four days (during the seven months she was available); 1902, thirty-four days; 1901, twenty-nine days.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the sum of £1,112 included in or in addition to the cost of stores?

Mr. PRETYMAN asked for notice.

Grouping of Highland Regiments.

MASTER of ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, under his new scheme for the redistribution of depôts in Scotland, he will group the Highland Light Infantry, the second senior Highland regiment, with the other Highland regiments at Perth Depot.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): The grouping has been carefully arranged to avoid as far as possible any territorial displacement. The Highland Light Infantry have now been at

Hamilton since 1881, and it would not, therefore, appear practicable to adopt the action suggested in the Question.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Do I understand that the territorial system has been abandoned by the War Office and that Highland regiments and Lowlanders are to be mingled together?

[No Answer was returned.]

British Central African Natives in the Transvaal Mines.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state how many of the natives recruited from the British Central Africa Protectorate for labour in the Transvaal have arrived at the mines, how many have succumbed to disease, and how many have returned home.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): The latest information I have received states that 1,385 have gone to the mines, that 134 have succumbed to disease, and that 709 have returned home, the rest not having completed their period of work. I have recently informed Lord Milner that he will no doubt agree with me that if this rate of mortality continues the experiment must cease. I believe the mortality has recently not been so heavy.

Transvaal—Chinese Coolies and Secret Societies.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has any information relating to the reported arrest of thirty-two Chinamen on the Simmer and Jack Mine on the charge of forming a secret society; whether the society was in the nature of a trade union; and what punishment was inflicted.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The hon. Member promised to furnish me with the report on which he bases his Question, but has not done so. I have not yet received the information from Lord Milner, but will communicate with the hon. Member as soon as I receive it.

Mr. WHITLEY: I regret that I misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman; I thought he was going to cable for information.

Transvaal Gold Mines—Labour and Output.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies will he say the number of white and coloured men working on the Transvaal gold mines in the month of August before the war and the value of gold produced; and will he state the figures for the month of December, 1904.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The figures for July, 1899, which will no doubt equally satisfy the hon. Member, are given at page 110 of Cd. 2104. White men employed on the Witwatersrand Mines, 12,330; coloured men employed, 107,482; gold output for the Transvaal, £1,737,861. The figures for December, 1904, are:—Whites in employ on the last day of the month, 15,023; coloured labourers and Chinese, 104,524; gold output, £1,538,377; representing an increase in white labour of nearly 2,500, whilst coloured and Chinese labour was still nearly 3,000 behind the figure given for 1899.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us whether those figures of white labour include the men engaged in building compounds?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have answered that Question before. They are inclusive of those men.

White Men's Wages in the Transvaal Mines.

Mr. MARKHAM: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, seeing the Mining Returns of the late Boer Government showed the average wage paid to white men on the gold mines was over £1 per day, he can say what is the present average wage; and whether since the war there has been any reduction in the standard rates of wages of white men; and can he say the approximate amount of wages at present monthly paid to white men on the gold mines over and above what was paid before the war.

MR. LYTTELTON: The Government mining engineer in his report for the year 1902–3 states that the rate of wages paid to skilled white workmen remained practically at the same level as obtained before the war: and in his report for 1903–4 he says that the rate of pay earned by European mine employees practically remains unchanged. For the year, June, 1903, to June, 1904, I find that the average wage comes to very nearly £1. The increased numbers of white men now employed on the Rand as compared with July, 1899, amounting to over 2,500, represents approximately a monthly sum of over £60,000 in excess of the amount previously paid to white labour.

Self-Government for the Transvaal—Boer Leaders' Speeches.

MR. MARKHAM: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Lord Milner has forwarded him a report of the speeches of Generals Botha, De la Rey, and Mr. Esselen, delivered at Pretoria on January 28th and at Heidelberg on February 1st, calling his attention to the statements of those speakers that the Boers declined to take any part in the government of the Transvaal till full self-government had been granted to the colony in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Vereeniging, and that if His Majesty's Government were of opinion that the time was not ready for granting this, the Boers would prefer the existing form of government should be maintained to any form of part self-government; and will he say what reply has been given to the representations of the Boer leaders on this subject.

MR. LYTTELTON: The answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is [in the affirmative. I have deferred making a reply to the representations of the Boer leaders for the present. But I would point out that Article 7 of the Terms of Surrender runs as follows:—"Military administration in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony will, at the earliest possible date, be succeeded by civil government, and, as soon as circumstances permit, representative institutions leading up to self-government will be introduced."

MR. MARKHAM asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had any information from South Africa as to whether the country was ready for responsible government.

MR. LYTTELTON replied that he had a great deal of information on the subject.

MR. MARKHAM asked how long it would be before an opportunity would be given to discuss this question.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said that on the Colonial Vote, which under the exigencies of Supply must be taken before March 31st, he would be able to meet that demand.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the Government last so long?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If they do not last so long the arrangement will fall to the ground.

Coolie Riots in the Transvaal.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that five Chinese coolies have each been sentenced to six months hard labour and eleven others each to three months hard labour in connection with a riot at the Simmer and Jack Mine on January 21st; whether the prisoners were represented at the trial by counsel or in any other way; and whether the proceedings were explained to them by interpreter; and, if he has no information on these matters, whether he will obtain the same from Lord Milner.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have telegraphed to Lord Milner for the information, but have not yet received the reply.

Effect of Chinese upon White Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the steady decline in the proportion of white labour as compared with the proportion of coloured labour employed in the Transvaal mining industry, he will continue the warning issued in the January Circular of the Emigration Office against white miners going to the Transvaal at the present time in search of work, and advise the Government to institute a Parliamentary inquiry into the results of the introduction of Chinese labour upon white labour in the Transvaal mining industry.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The decline in the proportion of white to coloured labour in the Transvaal mining industry cannot be described as steady, inasmuch as during 1904 it varied considerably from month to month, and I understand that it will continue to vary as different stages of development are reached. The Emigrants InformationOffice will continue to warn intending emigrants, so long as the supply of white labour in the Transvaal is in excess of the demand. I see no reason for instituting the Parliamentary enquiry proposed.

South African War Compensation Claims.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what has been the total amount voted for compensation for damages sustained during the war in South Africa; how much of this amount has already been paid away; what is the amount of claims still to be dealt with; and who in South Africa is responsible for attending to these matters in the Transvaal, Orange River State, the Cape Colony, and Natal.

Mr. LYTTELTON: In amplification of the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member's Question on this subject on March 29th† last session, I would refer him for an explanation of what has been devoted to compensation to the despatch from Sir Arthur Lawley, printed in Cd. 2104, pages 11 and 12; and I would add that up to November 30th, a sum of £1,564,367 had been spent out of Head I. C. of the Guaranteed Loan, and £5,490,905 under Head III. I am not in a position to say what is the number of claims in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony which remain to be finally dealt with. As I stated in March last, the claims have been assessed in the Cape Colony and Natal by Commissions appointed locally, and in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony by a Central Judicial Commission.

Mr. AINSWORTH: How long will it be before these claims are finally disposed of.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am afraid I cannot give a very accurate answer. I hope, however, in two or three months.

Rhodesia—Case of the late James Murray.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has yet received any reply to the inquiry he addressed to the High Commissioner for Rhodesia regarding a sum of £25 odd left by the late James Murray, alias M'Gavan, and which sum has never been accounted for by the administrator dative of his estate.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The hon. Member was informed in a letter dated June 7th last that no mention of the sum in question could be traced in the records of the hospital where the man died, but that the Master of the High Court was ready to make a further search if the relatives would state on what ground their inquiry was based. The mother of the deceased was so informed in a letter dated November 6th last, to which she has not replied.

Preferential Customs Duties for British Goods in the Colonies.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will inform th House what preferential reduction of Customs Duties is allowed upon British goods compared to foreign goods imported into the Dominion of Canada, Cape Colony and Natal, the Transvaal, the Orange State and Rhodesia, and New Zealand; and if he has any official information to the effect that a like preferential advantage to British goods will be adopted by the Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The amount of the preferential reduction varies on different classes of articles under the three tariffs of Canada, South Africa, and New Zealand to such an extent that it could not be set forth in an oral reply to a Question, but full information will be found in the latest Return of Colonial Import Duties (Cd. 2185). No official information has been received as to the intention of the Commonwealth of Australia to adopt a tariff giving a similar preferential advantage to British goods.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxii., 976.

Employment in the Congo Free State.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government of Lagos has recently issued a notice warning native workmen against going to the Congo Free State in search of employment on account of the low level of wages and the treatment to which they may be subjected in the interior; and, if so, whether he will draw the attention of the Governments of the other West African Colonies to this notice.

Mr. LYTTELTON: Yes, and I will draw the attention of the other Governments to the notice.

Mecca Pilgrimage—Theft of Charitable Funds.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the sum of £E8,000 was this year stolen from the Mahmal Escort before the pilgrimage started from Abbassyeh (Cairo); will he state whether this money formed part of the sum placed at the disposal of the Mahmal Escort by the Government of Egypt for charitable gifts to the poor of Mecca and Medina; and what is the entire amount thus allocated.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): His Majesty's Government have no information on the subject.

National Finance—Provision for Realised Deficits.

Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer under which Finance Act provision is made for a realised deficit, or part thereof, being carried forward into the accounts of the succeeding year; and whether it is proposed to lay Supplementary Estimates to provide for the balance of last year's deficit amounting to £1,500,000.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): If the hon. Member will be good enough to look at my Budget Statement of last year he will see how I proposed to deal with the draft made upon balances. Neither a Supplementary Estimate, nor any provision in the Finance Act, is required to carry out those proposals. The Sinking Fund Act of 1875 gives the Treasury standing powers to apply any surplus revenue in strengthening balances.

Mr. McCRAE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether there is any precedent for not meeting a deficit by taxation?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Oh yes, Sir, there are plenty of precedents, and I quoted some in the course of the Budget discussion last year. I should be inclined to think the course I have pursued is the more usual one.

The Budget.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the lateness of Easter this year, it is his intention to bring in his Budget before the Easter holidays; and, if so, whether he can yet fix the date.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not yet able to fix a date for the Budget Statement.

Mr. LOUGH: Will it be before Easter?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think so.

Mr. LOUGH: I will put the Question again on Monday.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot promise to state definitely on Monday.

Post Office Savings Bank—Depositors' Accounts.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the accounts of depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank are subject to inspection by the public; and, further, if the depositor is liable to be called upon by the secretary of friendly societies to account for how he came by money lodged to credit.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The accounts of depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank are not subject to inspection by the public, and the strictest secrecy is observed in regard to them. The Registrar of Friendly Societies (to whom I assume the hon. Member to refer) is the authority constituted by Parliament to settle all questions arising between the Postmaster-General and depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank; and in fulfilment of this duty it is open to him to make such inquiries as he thinks necessary.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the Registrar of Friendly Societies allowed to inspect confidential accounts?

Lord STANLEY: Yes, Sir, if he thinks it necessary. He is constituted by Act of Parliament to settle any question arising between the Postmaster-General and depositors.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Is there any statutory authority for this violation of secrecy?

Lord STANLEY: I believe so.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the noble Lord ascertain?

Lord STANLEY: Yes, Sir.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: Is it competent for the Registrar to call upon depositors to come before him and explain the origin of their deposits, and has he to pay their expenses if he finds they are legitimate and *bonâ fide*?

Lord STANLEY asked for notice of that Question.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Case of Mr. Philip Cook.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that on April 5th last, Mr. Philip J. Cook applied before Mr. Fordham at the North London Police Court for a certificate of exemption from vaccination for his infant child, and that, although he explained that a certificate had been granted to him at that Court on a former occasion for another child, the magistrate declined to grant a certificate, that application was renewed a few days later before Mr. Cluer, who refused on the ground that it was extremely undesirable that he should overrule his colleague's ruling, and as an appeal at the Thames Police Court before Mr. Dickenson, who had granted the first certificate, failed on account of the applicant not being resident within the district of the Court, will the Secretary of State consider the advisability of directing the attention of Metropolitan Police Magistrates to the remarks made by the Lord Chief Justice on July 27th last when addressing the Grand Jury at Birmingham relative to the principle on which the Act ought to be administered, especially having regard to the fact that in the present instance the applicant was eventually forced to have his second child vaccinated under the pressure of a summons, although he still persisted in the same conscientious objections which secured him a certificate of exemption for his first child.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): Mr. Cook wrote to me on February 9th and requested my intervention in this matter. The granting of certificates of exemption from vaccination is, however, placed by the statute within the discretion of the magistrates, and I have no authority to interfere with that discretion. The attention of all the Metropolitan Police Magistrates was called, by a circular issued in September last, to the remarks of the Lord Chief Justice at the Birmingham Summer Assizes.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay on the Table a copy of the Memorandum issued by the Home Office?

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I see no objection to that.

The Disaster to Holyhead Fishermen.

Mr. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the case of the poor dependents of the five men who sacrificed their lives in attempting the rescue of the sailors in danger of shipwreck at Holyhead on Sunday the 26th ultimo; and whether he can do anything towards assisting them.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): My attention has been drawn to the case, which was one in which great courage appears to have been shown by the unfortunate men who lost their lives, and I will consider the question whether anything can be done for the dependents whom they have left behind them. I fear that in any event the utmost the Board of Trade could do would be to give a small gratuity.

Freight Charges to South African Ports.

Sir CHARLES McLAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the representations of the Incorporated Federated Associations of Boot and Shoe Manufacturers of Great Britain and Ireland on the subject of differential shipping rates to South African ports, whereby shipping companies charge a rate per ton for the carriage of boots and shoes from British ports which is more than double the rate charged for the carriage of the same class of goods from New York direct to South Africa; and whether he will investigate the matter and take any action to redress the inequality complained of.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I have received a copy of a resolution passed by the Incorporated Federated Associations of Boot and Shoe Manufacturers of Great Britain and Ireland. The whole subject of freight charges to and from South Africa, including differential charges made from competing ports, has for some time past engaged the attention of the Government at home. A Conference of the Colonial Governments was recently held to consider what steps should be taken to deal effectively with the question, and the Conference has not yet finally concluded its deliberations. The resolutions already adopted at the Conference are receiving the consideration of the authorities.

American Wheat and Flour Exports to the United Kingdom.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if there was any reduction in 1904 in the exports of wheat and flour from the United States of America to the United Kingdom compared to the previous year; and whether the deficiency was made up from Canada, India, and Australia.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: There was a large reduction in the imports of wheat and flour from the United States into the United Kingdom in 1904 as compared with the previous year. The deficiency was mainly made up by increased imports from Australia, India, Argentine, and Russia. The imports from Canada, however, showed a decline.

Comparative Prices of Bread in London and Manchester.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade what was the average price of the quartern loaf of the quality usually consumed by the working classes in London and Manchester in March, 1902, March, 1903, March, 1904, and February, 1905; and what were the receipts from the registration fee upon imported wheat, meal, and flour in March, 1903.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: There is some difficulty in stating figures which shall be strictly comparable over the whole period, but so far as can be ascertained the prices required were approximately as follows:—

	London.	Manchester.
March, 1902 .	4d. & 4½d.	4d.
March, 1903 .	4½d & 5d.	4d.
March, 1904 .	5d. & 5½d.	4½d.
February, 1905	5d.	4½d.

The receipts from the duty on imported wheat, wheat meal, and flour in March, 1903, amounted to £127,062.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): Can we have the comparative prices of sugar for the same period?

[No Answer was returned.]

Undischarged Bankrupts and Company Promotion.

MR. MARKHAM: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been drawn to the practice of undischarged bankrupts promoting companies and trading in the names of their wives; and will he introduce legislation to prevent this evasion of the criminal law.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The practice to which the Question refers, so far as it exists, has been made possible by the Married Women's Property Acts. I do not understand the statement in the Question that the practice constitutes an evasion of the criminal law, but it is, in my opinion, highly objectionable. There would, however, be great difficulty in amending the law in the sense of the Question, but any suggestion which the hon. Member has to offer will be fully considered.

MR. MARKHAM: Will the hon. and learned Gentleman institute an inquiry into the widespread evils arising, especially among the working classes, from this practice?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Any information the hon. Gentleman can give me on the subject will be carefully considered.

The Hooley-Lawson Prosecution.

MR. MARKHAM: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General will he say why he decided not to commence criminal proceedings against Mr. Hooley, arising out of the case of "Bradshaw *versus* Kelly," seeing that Mr. Justice Darling, who tried this case, stated Mr. Hooley had committed fraud; will he say the costs the Treasury has incurred in the recent criminal proceedings against Mr. Hooley, and who was responsible for instituting this particular prosecution.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The case of "Bradshaw *versus* Kelly" led to inquiries being made by the Director of Public Prosecutions as to that case, and inquiry was also made as to other transactions which came to his knowledge. It was found after full inquiry and careful consideration that the facts and evidence available did not justify the institution by him of any criminal proceedings in respect of those transactions. The recent prosecution of Mr. Hooley and Mr. Lawson was instituted by my directions. The costs of that prosecution, in which Mr. Hooley was acquitted and H. J. Lawson convicted, were £3,529 13s. 4d.

St. Joseph's Catholic School, Nymphsfield, Gloucestershire.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that there is dissatisfaction with the action of the Gloucestershire Local Education Committee in its treatment of St. Joseph's Catholic School, Nymphsfield: and whether, in view of the representations made to the Board of Education on the subject, he will state what action he proposes to take.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The Board have carefully considered this case and given their decision. The matter is not at present before them.

MR. BOLAND: Has the Department inquired into this matter or upon what inquiry was the decision come to?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The local authority conducted a very careful public inquiry, and on the result of that inquiry we came to the conclusion that it was not necessary to hold another inquiry.

MR. BOLAND: Has any inquiry been conducted by the Board of Education or has it come purely from the local authorities?

Sir. WILLIAM ANSON: The Board of Education had access to all the documents, and they were satisfied with the decision of the local authorities.

Foreign Trawlers in the Moray Firth.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he will state how many foreign trawlers have been observed fishing in the Moray Firth during the year ending December 31st, 1904, and their respective nationalities.

*The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton): The total number of foreign trawlers which were observed fishing in the Moray Firth in 1904 were: Norwegian, 25; Belgian, 4; Dutch, 2; Swedish, 1; making a total of 32.

North Sea Fishery Investigations.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, having regard to the fact that H.M.S. "Jackal," though lent by the Board of Admiralty for the purpose of protecting the interests of the line fishermen, was engaged last year on International North Sea Investigations, will he explain in what respect the steam trawler "Goldseeker," which was specially hired by the Fishery Board to assist in these investigations, failed to meet the requirements of the Board; and will he state her tonnage and speed.

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: The "Goldseeker," whose tonnage is 199 tons gross, and speed 9 knots, was hired to conduct the trawling and biological experiments in connection with the North Sea Investigations and is well-fitted for that purpose. For the short periodical cruises necessary for the hydrographical survey of the stormy seas north of the Shetlands, which is equally part of the investigations, her size and power are insufficient.

Mr. WEIR: Then why was the "Jackal" put on the survey instead of the "Goldseeker?"

*Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: I presume she was better fitted for it.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Terence Reilly.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, as representing the Irish Office, whether any action has been taken by the Estates Commissioners for the restoration to his holding of Terence Reilly, of Springtown Granard, who is in a condition of destitution, and for whom there are vacant lands adjoining if the Commissioners will purchase them.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): The former holding of this evicted tenant is in the occupation of a new tenant. Reilly was informed that the Commissioners could not interfere with the new tenant, but that when untenanted lands are acquired in the neighbourhood his case will be considered. No such lands have yet been acquired.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Have the Estates Commissioners approached the new tenant to see if he is willing to surrender the holding for reasonable compensation?

Mr. ATKINSON asked for notice.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: If I find out will the right hon. Gentleman request the Estates Commissioners to take the case into consideration?

Mr. ATKINSON: I am sure any information given by the hon. Gentleman will be carefully considered.

Irish Elementary Science Sub-Organisers.

Mr. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why the sub-organisers in elementary science have, with one exception, been notified that their work shall cease on March 31st, in view of the feeling in favour of education in elementary science since that subject was introduced, and of the fact that the training courses for teachers and the whole organising work is now virtually and suddenly stopped.

Mr. ATKINSON: The services of the Head Organiser of elementary science and of two of his assistants, have been retained permanently, and the grants for science apparatus have also been continued. I beg to refer to my reply to the Question on this subject addressed to me yesterday † by the hon. Member for the St. Patrick's Division, in which I entered into the matter at some length.

Traction Traffic on County Down Roads.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the injury done to the roads between Newcastle, county Down, and Newry by traction engines, and to the inconvenience caused to residents by the working of those engines at night; and whether steps will be taken to limit the hours of working and to compel the owners of the traction engines to contribute to the upkeep of the roads.

MR. ATKINSON: The Local Government Board have been informed that the road between Newcastle and Newry has been injured by traction-engine traffic. Under Section 6 of the Public Health (Ireland) Amendment Act, 1879, local authorities have power to make by-laws limiting the hours during which traction engines may pass over roads or highways in their districts. Section 23 of the Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878, empowers road authorities in England to recover the expenses caused by extraordinary traffic, which, it has been decided, includes the use of roads by traction engines. But this Act does not apply to Ireland, and the question of assimilating the law in the two countries would be a proper matter for consideration should a suitable opportunity present itself.

MR. MACVEAGH: Do the Government propose to make any effort to assimilate the law in England and Ireland?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a different Question altogether.

Dennehy Estate, County Kerry.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that several communications have passed between the tenants on the Dennehy Estate, Glencar, county Kerry, and the Congested Districts Board since the early part of the summer of 1904; and that the inspector of the Board visited the district on January 7th last; and, if so, can he state what decision has been arrived at, in view of the fact that processes have been issued against several of the tenants, and that the hanging gale has been included in all cases at the sessions held in Cahirciveen.

MR. ATKINSON: The Board are in correspondence with the owner, through his agent, of this estate with respect to the question of its purchase.

Distress in Sligo.

MR. WILLIAM McKILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Government has received resolutions calling upon them to make inquiry in reference to distress in the congested districts of Sligo, and to take steps to avert suffering and starvation in those districts; and, if so, will he say what has been done in those districts in response to the representations made by local bodies and meetings.

MR. ATKINSON: Representations to this effect have been received. The condition of the districts in question has received the careful attention of the Local Government Board, whose inspectors have made personal investigations in the localities where exceptional distress is apprehended. The inspectors are satisfied that no distress exists of a character which cannot be dealt with by the resources of the ordinary Poor Laws. They will continue, however, to give the matter their close attention.

Public Works in Sligo.

MR. WILLIAM McKILLOP: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any portion of the money voted under the Marine Works Act has been spent in the county of Sligo; and, if so, how much; can he say whether there is any money now available under the Marine Works Act or any other for the construction and improvement of fishing piers and harbours in Ireland.

---

† See page 588.

Mr. ATKINSON: The reply to the first inquiry is in the negative. There is a small balance amounting to about £4,000 on foot of the funds provided under the Sea Fisheries Act, 1883.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): Why is it Sligo has received no grant, although the necessity for public works has been urged upon the Government over and over again by public bodies of the county?

Lough Melvin.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a memorial has been received by the Congested Districts Board praying for the assistance of that Board in lowering the water level of Lough Melvin; and, if so, has the Board considered the memorial and can he state what action the Board proposes to take in reference to it.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Board will consider the memorial at its next meeting.

The Duke of Abercorn and the Pettigo Magistracy.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in response to his suggestion made on February 24th, 1904, recommendations by way of memorials signed by the principal lay Catholic inhabitants of Pettigo were made to the Duke of Abercorn as Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Donegal for the appointment of two Catholic gentlemen, fully qualified for the position, to the magisterial bench of Pettigo where one only of the seven magistrates is a Catholic, the majority of the population of the district being Catholics; whether he is aware that the Duke of Abercorn did not acknowledge the receipt of this memorial; and, if so, whether he will inquire whether the Duke of Abercorn forwarded the memorial to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; and whether any, and, if so, what steps will be taken by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland to make the bench more representative of the religion of the majority of the people in this district.

Mr. ATKINSON: My right hon. friend the Member for Dover stated on February 24th,† 1904, that recommendations for the appointment of gentlemen to the Commission of the Peace are made to the Lord Chancellor or the Lieutenant of the County, and that any such recommendations, if made, would be duly considered. I understand that the petty sessions at Pettigo are held once a month and that they are well attended by the local justices, one of whom is believed to be a Catholic. The question of the sufficiency of the local Bench is entirely one for the Lord Chancellor and the Lieutenant of the County, and the matter is not one calling for the intervention of the Executive.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Did the Duke of Abercorn get the memorial and did he forward it to the Lord Chancellor? Why did he not reply to it?

Mr. ATKINSON: I cannot say what memorials the Duke of Abercorn receives.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is it true or not that out of seven magistrates appointed only one is a Catholic?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Now, Sir, I want to ask a Question which distinctly arises out of the Answer the right hon. Gentleman has not given.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Question on the Paper has been answered.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: The right hon. Gentleman has not given the Answer he ought to have given.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The time for Questions is limited. Notice should be given of any further Questions.

Arnott Estate, Bandon.

Mr. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that the representatives of the Arnott Estate at Bandon, in the county of Cork, are breaking up the estate into parcels for the purpose of sale; and whether, in view of the provisions of the Act, that estates shall be sold as a whole, the Commissioners will refuse to sanction such sales.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxx., 851.

Mr. ATKINSON: No proceedings for the sale of the Arnott Estate, county Cork, have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. CREAN: Would such an apportionment be approved by the Commissioners?

Mr. ATKINSON: The Commissioners must first be informed of the circumstances.

De Freyne Estate.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the De Freyne Estate has been sold to the Congested Districts Board; and if he can state the number of tenants on the estate.

Mr. ATKINSON: No, Sir. The negotiations with the Board are still proceeding.

Irish Local Government Board Orders—Downpatrick Union Suggestion.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board has considered the suggestion of the Downpatrick Union that the numerous Rules and Orders issued prior to and since the passing of the Local Government Act, 1898, should be issued in volume form, and indexed, and circulated amongst public boards in Ireland.

Mr. ATKINSON: On Thursday last† I referred the hon. Gentleman to three sets of Parliamentary Papers containing the Rules and Orders issued by the Board since the passing of the Act of 1898. These volumes, which are carefully indexed, are on sale and may be purchased by any local authority requiring them. The Government has no funds at its disposal for circulating the volumes amongst public boards free of cost.

Virginia Road to Drogheda Mail Contract.

Mr. SHEEHY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General for what term is the contract for the conveyance by road of the mails from Virginia Road to Drogheda; when does it terminate; how much per annum does this service cost; and whether, seeing that this road route is almost parallel to and near the railway at every point, will he say at what time are the morning mails from Dublin delivered in Oldcastle, Kells, and Navan, and what would be the difference of cost to have these mails conveyed by a train timed to run from Drogheda on the arrival of the morning mail train from Dublin, with the transference of the carriage of the night mails from Virginia to the railway company, as compared with the present service; and whether he can see his way to examine the subject carefully with the view to a reform of the present system.

Lord STANLEY: The contracts for the conveyance of the night mails by road between Drogheda and Virginia Road are all terminable at three months notice. The payments to the contractors amount to £821 a year. The morning mails from Dublin are delivered at Navan at 11.20 a.m.; Kells at 11.30 a.m.; Oldcastle at 12 noon. I do not know what would be the additional cost of the acceleration desired by the hon. Member, but it would be considerable. As the cost of the postal service in the district is already very high as compared with the revenue from the correspondence, I regret that I am unable to effect the desired improvement.

Aughacashel, County Leitrim—Telegraphic Arrangements.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether a memorial has been received at the General Post Office, Dublin, praying for the establishment of a postal telegraph office at Aughacashel, county Leitrim; if so, has the memorial been brought under his notice; and whether, in view of the need of a telegraph office in the district named, he would have further inquiry made with a view to complying with the request of memorialists.

---

† See page 188.

LORD STANLEY: A memorial has been received, but I regret to say that I should not be warranted in establishing a telegraph office at Aughacashel. I understand there is no village there and that there would be practically no telegraph revenue, while on the other hand the line would cost £237, and the annual expense would be heavy.

Addresses in Irish on Parcels.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state when the regulations found in paragraph 7, page 8, of the Post Office Guide were substituted for those previously in existence with reference to the address of parcels; whether such change was made in consequence of the number of parcels, addressed in Irish, which were despatched through post offices in Ireland; and whether steps will be taken to revise the regulations in consonance with the wishes of the Irish people.

LORD STANLEY: The regulations referred to were altered in October last as a result of a question raised respecting the treatment of a registered letter addressed in Irish, but they extend, of course, to parcels addressed in other languages. It may be explained that registered letters and parcels have to be handed in at a post office, and it is reasonable that the opportunity should be taken of requiring the senders to give a translation of the address in English. I see no ground for altering the rule in question.

MR. BOLAND: If the noble Lord is prepared to enter into a fight with the Gaelic League he will be defeated.

Letters and Parcels Addressed in the Irish Language.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that in paragraph 4, page 442, of the Post Office Guide, with reference to letters addressed in the Russian language, it is stated that the name of the town and of the province should also be added in English, French, or German; and whether, in view of the fact that German characters, which are admittedly different from English, are recommended in the case of letters addressed from England to Russia, he will state why Irish characters cannot be used in addressing letters and parcels in Ireland.

LORD STANLEY: Letters from the United Kingdom for Russia centralise in London, where the French and German forms of the names of towns and provinces are sufficiently known for sorting purposes. I may point out to the hon. Member that the use of German characters is not recommended in the paragraph of the Post Office Guide to which he refers, but simply that of the German names of towns and provinces which may be, and quite commonly are, written in the same characters as English and French.

MR. BOLAND: But if there is nothing in the regulation to say that German characters must not be used, how does the noble Lord say they are not recommended?

Court of Criminal Appeal—The Beck Case.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intend to take any steps to prevent such miscarriages of justice as have lately occurred in the cases of Adolf Beck and of Underwood; and whether, having regard to the frequency of cases of hardship in the administration of the criminal law, he would think it desirable to institute inquiries, by the appointment of a Royal Commission or otherwise, into the circumstances under which arrests on suspicion are made, the conditions and periods of detention before trial of prisoners, and the best method of adequately compensating innocent persons wrongfully convicted and imprisoned.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The case of Mr. Adolf Beck has been the subject of exhaustive inquiry by a Committee, presided over by the Master of the Rolls, and in accordance with the recommendations of that Committee a Bill has been drafted and introduced in another place to effect a change in the law which, in the opinion of the Committee, will prevent miscarriages of justice such as that which occurred in the Beck case. Certain administrative improvements have also been made in accordance with the recommendations of that Committee. Cases of hardship in the administration of the criminal law must occasionally occur; but hardships such as those in the Beck and Underwood cases are so rare that I do not think they call for any further inquiry.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): In connection with the Beck case and the proposals of the Government, will the right hon. Gentleman consider the propriety of establishing a Court of Criminal Appeal in this country, such as exists in other countries?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not qualified to give an Answer without notice upon a matter of such importance, nor would my opinion be worth much if I gave it; but I have always understood that expert opinion in this country was against a Court of Criminal Appeal.

MR. LOUGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman order a Return to be given of the cases of hardship brought before the Government in recent years? I think they are very numerous.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope the hon. Gentleman is mistaken. Perhaps he will put the Question to the Home Office and my right hon. friend will answer it.

Underfed School Children.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that the provision of free meals for destitute school children in Manchester came to an end on Friday last for lack of funds; and whether, as the distress is still acute in parts of the city, he proposes taking any action for enabling the educational authority to continue the provision of such meals at the cost of the community.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that in Leeds, where distress due to bad trade is very acute, the Lord Mayor has intimated that after next week the free meals to destitute school children will require to be stopped owing to lack of funds; and whether, in view of the hardship which this will impose on several hundreds of children, he will reconsider his decision not to introduce a Bill this session to empower educational authorities to provide meals for destitute children at the cost of the public.

DR. MACNAMARA: May I at the same time ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the failure of voluntary effort in several parts of the country to cope with the needs of hungry children, he will now reconsider his decision not to introduce legislation this session to give effect to the unanimous recommendation of the Physical Deterioration (1904) Committee, to the effect that local education authorities should be empowered, out of the funds at their disposal, to provide meals for hungry children.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have received no information confirming the hon. Member's statement that provision of free meals for destitute school children in Manchester came to an end last Friday from lack of funds. I am advised that it applies to only one, and not to all sources of charitable supply. I am informed, with regard to Leeds, that the Lord Mayor's Fund for free meals was raised to meet exceptional distress, and when that fund was exhausted a fortnight ago the situation was considered by a committee representative of all parts of the city, and the Lord Mayor decided, after careful consideration by the committee, that the distress was no longer exceptional, but that the existing distress was chronic, and could be met by the ordinary charitable agencies. It was resolved to discontinue the fund, and not to try to raise more money. I am informed that no member of the committee demurred to this decision.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: May I tell the right hon. Gentleman that my information is official, and free meals were stopped at Manchester last Friday. Will he not reconsider his decision not to introduce a Bill empowering the authorities to provide free meals out of the rates?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member for North Camberwell has a Question on the same subject. I am not prepared to give any such pledge.

Dr. MACNAMARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman be willing to receive representations from the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil and myself as to the extreme urgency of the question of hungry children, with a view to a reconsideration of the decision not to introduce legislation?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The last thing I should refuse to do is to receive information on so important a subject from any Gentleman who is a Member of this House, but I will suggest to the hon. Gentleman that his representations should be primarily addressed to the Board of Education or the Local Government Board.

Dr. MACNAMARA: But the Board of Education have refused to adopt the recommendations of the Physical Deterioration Committee.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I said I could not give any pledge that we should deal with this matter in the manner which the Committee proposed. I do not think anything that the hon. Gentleman can say will reverse that decision, but I shall be glad to hear him.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): Could not the Report of the Physical Deterioration Committee be considered by a Select Committee of this House?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will consider that Question, but cannot give a definite Answer at the present time. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will put the Question again in a week.

Ministry of Commerce.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the interest taken in the question by chambers of commerce of the country, he is able to say when the Bill for establishing a Minister of Commerce and Industry will be introduced.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid that the amount of work we have to get through as regards Supply makes it impossible for me to give a definite Answer to my hon. friend.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I desire to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has any objection to putting off the next stage of the Navy Estimates till Monday.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman made an appeal to me two days ago not to take the Navy Estimates on Thursday. At that time I hoped the information he was asking for would be available in time to make the request for postponement somewhat unreasonable in its character. My hopes, however, have been disappointed, and I acknowledge that under the circumstances there is a claim for postponement. I shall therefore take Supplementary Estimates to-morrow and defer the Navy Estimates till Monday.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Norman Lamont, esquire, for the County of Bute.

NEW BILLS.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897," presented by Mr. Shackleton; supported by Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Bell, Mr. Crooks, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Burns, Mr. Thomas Richards, and Mr. William Abraham; to be read a second time upon Friday, May 12th, and to be printed. [Bill 84.]

MARINE INSURANCE BILL.

"To codify the Law relating to Marine Insurance," presented by Mr. Attorney-General; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 85.]

DOGS BILL.

"To consolidate and amend the enactments relating to Injury to Live Stock by Dogs, and otherwise to amend the Law relating to Dogs," presented by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 86.]

OPEN SPACES BILL.

"To consolidate the enactments relating to Open Spaces," presented by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 87.]

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): Sir, in rising to introduce the Scotch Education Bill I make no apology for doing so under what is generally known as the Ten Minutes Rule, because the result is no doubt that the Bill is enabled to be introduced at an earlier date in the session than otherwise, and we thereby hope the House and public will be put in possession of the special details of the measure earlier, and also that by this earlier introduction we may be more certain that the Bill will ultimately find its place upon the Statute-book. As the House will also be aware from the King's Speech, the main features of the Bill are practically the same as those considered in this House last session, and accordingly my duty in introducing it will be amply discharged by explaining the principal points in which there is any difference from the Bill before the House last session. I am sure the House will pardon me for a moment if I say that while I quite recognise that upon these grounds no apology is necessary to the House, I cannot but recall to myself that, in this session, the Bill will no longer be under the guidance of my right hon. friend the late Secretary for Scotland, and I am sure it will not be regarded as affectation or modesty on my part if I say no one recognises more to the full than I do that the absence of his great Parliamentary skill and experience and his other abilities will make it necessary for me, not only at this stage, but in all the stages of the Bill, to make larger demands upon the indulgence of the House on both sides than he would have found it necessary to do. At the same time I am encouraged to think that that demand will meet with a ready response, because, Sir, I feel sure that on both sides of the House it is recognised that the time has come when we should do our best to give to Scottish education a large and wide measure of reform. While we quite understand that questions of considerable importance will require to be discussed in this Bill, they are not, I venture to think, questions which will give rise to keen Party feeling or increase political bias. I am sure that all Members of the House on both sides are anxious to do their best for Scottish education, and they will give me credit for being actuated by a similar desire. It is in that view, I think, I shall get a generous indulgence so far as it is necessary in every stage of this Bill through the House.

The House will remember that in the course of last session about half of the clauses of the Bill then before it passed through Committee, and so far as the present Bill is concerned it practically takes up the Bill as it then stood, and so far as it had then been considered. The districts will remain the same as before; but it will be in the recollection of those Members of the House who interested themselves in the matter that in the clauses dealing with the districts there were introduced in Committee various provisions giving elasticity and power to the Secretary for Scotland to divide counties and districts, and in the present Bill these powers will be further extended and enlarged. Then in the first part of the Bill—this Bill practically corresponds with that part of the Bill of last session—the only other change really is a subsidiary one as to the mode of election in burghs. We have at the request of the burghs provided in the present Bill that burghs and counties shall, instead of being treated as electoral divisions of the counties, conduct their school board elections as other burghs do, that is to say on the same day as the ordinary municipal elections, and of course on the municipal franchise. That will apply to all burghs with the exception of a few police burghs which have been called into existence since the 1899 Act, and where there would have been a good deal of complication, if we had adopted that course, in respect of their area not coinciding with the electoral division of the county. Practically the result is that at the request of the burghs we have given that concession to them. The clauses as to managers remain the same as in the Committee stage of the Bill of last year: managers will be optional in enumerated districts and compulsory in others but with a perfectly free hand for school boards to elect managers as they think proper.

With regard to the second part of the Bill which deals with the powers of the school board, the House will remember that nearly the whole, I think the whole, of that was dealt with by the Committee last session. As to the clause as to rating, the House will recollect that a proposal was introduced in an Amendment by Mr. Murray proposing to have rating partly by population and partly by valuation. The final opinion of the Committee as to that was that the clause was passed on a pledge that the Bill should be recommitted as to that clause with a view to its reconsideration. Subsequent consideration of the point satisfied my right hon. friend that the proposal which he had submitted in this Amendment was not one which he should adhere to, and accordingly we propose in this Bill—and this really is substantially the most important modification as compared with last year—so far as the rating clause is concerned to do this. There was a controversy, the House will remember, between the outlying country parishes and the burghs as to pooling the debts, and, as the country parishes said, making them pay for the higher elementary schools in the burghs, the answer from the burgh side being, "Yes, but you are getting the benefit of the secondary education schools." After full consideration they thought that answer was not perfectly accurate, and I do not know indeed that any proposal will preserve altogether the minute equilibrium between the claims of the counties and burghs, but giving the best consideration to the matter we could, and after hearing the views of all parties, what we propose to do is this. As to existing debt, so far as it represents capital expenditure, which I suppose will practically be expenditure on buildings and sites, we propose to divide that into two, cr rather that the school board shall divide it into two portions—so far as it represents expenditure on higher-class public schools, using the words in the sense of the 1872 Act, it shall be a charge upon the whole district, and so far as it represents expenditure on buildings and sites other than higher-class public schools—if I may be allowed to use the term expenditure on primary and elementary schools—it shall be treated as local and remain on the parishes which those elementary or local schools represent. The result is that debt representing charges in respect of higher-class or secondary schools will be placed upon the whole district, and the debt representing charges for elementary or primary schools or schools other than higher-class schools will remain parochial, as it is at present. The maintenance, of course, of both will be a charge upon the whole district. That is what we propose to do in regard to existing debt, and we propose also that with regard to future expenditure the same allocation shall be followed out. The result, the House will observe, is that so far as elementary or primary school capital charges are concerned they will remain parochial, but so far as higher-class school capital expenditure is concerned it will remain general over the district, and the maintenance charges with regard to both will be general. I quite appreciate, of course, that there are instances where that may work one way or the other differently from what it does at the present time, but upon the whole, and after consultation with the various parties interested, the proposal which we submit to the House seems to us the fairest which we can put before it, having regard to the competing interests of both sections of the community.

Then as to the deficiency, we adhere to our original proposal in the Bill that the deficiency shall be rated upon the parishes according to their valuation, that is to say, the parishes of each district shall have allocated to them a proportion of the deficiency corresponding to their valuation. We propose, however, to collect that deficiency as was done in the Bill of last year according to the several regulations observed in each parish, the several classifications and deductions; and, in fact, to continue to collect the school board rate as it is collected at present on the same terms as the Poor Law rate. I quite appreciate again that that is a point on which different views are held, and much is to be said on both sides, but, having given the best consideration to it we could, it seemed on the whole that that was the proper proposal which would meet with the most general acceptance.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Standing Order requires that the right hon. Gentleman's statement should only be a brief one.

Mr. SCOTT DICKSON: I shall only be a few minutes more. That is the main point. We propose also to give special powers, as promised last year, to school boards to provide books, and we also propose to give the provincial councils somewhat larger powers than they have to-day. The education fund will remain practically the same as before, except that the local authorities will get £100,000 which the Act of 1902 originally gave them and we shall take the surplus; otherwise that proposal remains exactly as it was. The only other matter is that we propose to put the sanitary inspection of the schools under the ordinary local sanitary authorities, the medical officers of health, and the sanitary inspector; and we propose to introduce a clause dealing with school boards raising up a large debit in view of the Bill. I think I have explained in the main the immediate changes between this and the Bill of last session, and I beg leave to move it.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Education in Scotland, and for other purposes connected therewith."—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

Mr. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) endorsed the Lord-Advocate's remarks with respect to the late Secretary for Scotland. He remarked that the Bill imported new topics and new methods of handling those topics which he thought provided elements of considerable danger as to its future. Still the general features remained the same. They were on the whole to retain their Scotch system; they were still to have universal school boards; they were still to have sole control of the taxpayer's money by representatives of the taxpayer, and they were still to have no embargo put upon the right of representatives to appoint teachers irrespective of creed or denomination. He thought it would have been a much wiser course for the Government to have accepted the lessons inflicted upon them last year and to have adhered to the text of their original Bill. All that had happened with reference to the new proposal was a complete justification of the criticisms offered. With regard to the new change as to the incidence of rating, he rejoiced that reward had been given to their efforts by the original proposals of the Bill having been gone back upon, but he confessed that when the Lord-Advocate went further he had very considerable doubt as to the setting up of new districts and as to their having constant trouble with regard to the incidence within those districts of certain classes of expenditure. It would have been far simpler and better to have taken the districts as they were now situated, giving them over to authorities united by freedom, united by interest, and united by responsibility. They would watch the text of the Bill with very great interest and they would not commit themselves as to its further progress. He asked that the Bill should be printed at an early date and circulated in Scotland in time for feeling in Scotland to ripen and mould itself, and that there should be no attempt suddenly to ask for a Second Reading until Scotland itself had been consulted. He remarked that the Government would have to have regard to the opinion of Scotch representatives with reference to the important matter of feeding children and also with reference to gipsy or tinker children, and concluded by stating that on the whole those representatives would not be adverse to a good and true measure adhering to the main lines of popular representative control such as they found embodied in the Bill.

Question agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Lord-Advocate and Mr. Cochrane.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Laws relating to Education in Scotland, and for other purposes connected therewith," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 88.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair].

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1904–5 (SOMALILAND).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £550,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Additional Expenditure in respect of the following Army Services, viz.—

	£
Vote 1. Pay, etc., of the Army	985,000
" 2. Medical Establishments, Pay, etc. -	21,000
" 6. Transport and Remounts - - -	265,000
" 7. Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies -	260,000
" 12. Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	2,000
" 14. Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other non-effective charges for Officers, etc. - -	1,000
" 15. Pensions and other non-effective charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others - - -	2,000
	1,536,000
Less Surpluses on other Votes	386,000
	1,150,000
Deduct Excess Appropriations-in-Aid -	600,000
	£550,000"

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to move the reduction of the Vote by £10,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item, Vote 1, Sub-head BB (Somaliland Expeditionary Force) be reduced by £10,000."—(*Mr. Charles Hobhouse.*)

Mr. PEEL (Manchester, S.) said that when the debate closed on the preceding evening he was making an attempt to discover the Mullah somewhere in the recesses of Somaliland. He was also trying to obtain information from the noble Lord who represented the Foreign Office as to the political and military position of the Mullah and the whereabouts of his following. The action of the Foreign Office had been very severely criticised by the hon. Member who moved the reduction, and the criticisms had been addressed to various points of view. The Foreign Office had been criticised first for plunging into the war; next for not starting the war soon enough; again, for starting it too soon; then for under-estimating the cost; and finally, for sending too small a force into the country. It was quite true that since the year 1886, when we first took up the responsibility for protecting the tribes of Somaliland, we had gained very wide experience of the nature of the *Hinterlands*, and we were now realising the responsibility thus thrown upon us. It was quite possible that had we at that time possessed the knowledge we had since obtained our attitude on this question might have been considerably altered. He would be very glad to know from the noble Lord what was the nature and extent, in point of time, of the responsibilities we had taken up towards these friendly tribes. When the matter was discussed a year ago there was some difference of opinion on the subject. The Secretary for War had practically declared that we had given them an absolute guarantee of security, but that statement was, to some extent, controverted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, who said it was putting our obligation towards the tribes too high. He believed he was right in saying that since we undertook the responsibility some of the tribes had been placed under the protection of Abyssinia; so that it was clear that if we had an absolute duty to look after them, we still had power to delegate that duty to others.

The hon. Member also criticised, he thought rather severely, at any rate in the case of a friendly Power, the action of the Italians. He said they had a very large protectorate, and he asked why they should not look after the Mullah and the tribes? He seemed to suggest that we were doing dirty work for the Italians, work the responsibility for which should have fallen upon them, instead of upon ourselves. There again he did not think the hon. Member had given sufficient consideration to the difficulties of the situation. The boundaries between the Italian, and British, and the Abyssinian protectorates were non-existent; they were imaginary lines of demarcation, and it was absolutely impossible to stand upon some line, as could be done if they were dealing with a country whose boundaries were clearly demarcated. Moreover our obligations with regard to the tribes were so strong that they could not be discharged by our saying, "You have been raided by the Mullah, who has driven your flocks away, but he has now gone into Italian territory, and you must look to the Italians for protection." He did not profess to know to what extent the Italians were in a position to give us assistance as regarded money and men. The hon. Member seemed to think that they ought to have done more, but he ought not to have forgotten that General Egerton, in his despatches, gave the highest praise to the Italian admiral for the assistance he had given our troops in stores and otherwise. He also intimated that he had had very valuable assistance from the Abyssinians, and his despatches showed that the Abyssinian expedition had had very considerable effect in restraining the operations of the Mullah. Short of capturing the Mullah himself a great deal had been done to diminish his power inasmuch as he had been defeated, and so had lost men, prestige, chattels, and stores. That, with a religious reformer of this kind, was almost better than if he had been killed outright, because the idea might then have arisen that he had become a sacred personage, and a series of myths might have grown up around his tomb. But he was now discredited, and in these cases an extinct volcano like the Mullah would be a lesson to other volcanoes not yet in eruption.

The question was, what should be done with Somaliland in the future? He was not certain that it would not be advantageous to hand the country back to the Indian Government. In many ways the Indian Government were able to deal with such a protectorate far better than the Foreign Office. They had considerable experiencee of such military operations as had lately been carried out, and they possessed a great number of officers with full knowledge of the manner in which all these tribes should be dealt with. The hon. Member for East Bristol had suggested that a Sandeman should be sent to Somaliland to exercise over the tribes there the same sort of control as had been exercised on the North-West Frontier of India and in Baluchistan. It was not easy to find such men, and there was also the difficulty that in India they had behind them the whole of the force concentrated in that peninsula, whereas the Somali tribes had no knowledge of British power, so that the exercise of moral force, partly from geographical considerations, would be far more difficult in Somaliland than on the North-West Frontier. Under Foreign Office control, officers had to be collected from all quarters of the British Empire, with the result that the force was of a very composite character, consisting of officers of all descriptions, who were extremely unlikely to be able to work together.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked who would pay the cost, if the administration was transferred to the Indian Government.

Mr. PEEL said that when India controlled Somaliland previously, the protectorate not only paid its way, but made a contribution to the finances of India. It should be remembered, also, that this protectorate was maintained largely with a view to the question of Aden, and Aden itself was controlled by India. Therefore, on almost every ground, Somaliland would be more naturally managed by India than by the Foreign Office.

Much had been said with regard to the obligations we had taken up towards these tribes, but there were reciprocal obligations on the part of the tribes towards us. But more than once in the recent war it had happened that the tribes we had undertaken to protect against the Mullah and similar persons had had considerable sympathy with these religious reformers; in fact, the Mullah might have been captured if these friendly tribes had given assistance at the right time. If, therefore, the very stringent obligations towards these tribes were being renewed, an investigation should be made as to whether these tribes had been faithful to us and had given all the assistance they could. He asked what were the arrangements now being made with regard to patrolling the coast, and how far the Italians were assisting us, because, if the smuggling in of arms and ammunition could be prevented, it would enormously lighten any future difficulty. He also asked what arrangements were being made for the future management and administration of Somaliland, what civil and military officers were to be kept there, what was the size and composition of the force to be maintained, where it was to be stationed, and what were the characters of the officers and their experience of the country. After the three expeditions which had been sent it might well be that, without being able to send a Sandeman, we might be able to get men who would exercise such an influence over these tribes as, if not to prevent religious reformers rising up, which perhaps was impossible, at any rate, to secure such early information as would enable us to know when troubles were brewing, the forces which might be necessary to cope with them, and the methods by which such eruptions should be met. He did not see how the late war could have been avoided; but it had been a very expensive business, and the country desired to be satisfied that, as a result, we had at least discharged our obligations to the tribes, broken the Mullah, settled the country, and obtained the likelihood of a long period of security.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.) pointed out that these War Office Estimates covered the expenses only of that portion of the war which had taken place within the last two years, during which period the conduct of operations had not been under the control of the Office with which he was connected. The hon. Member for East Bristol was under a misapprehension as to the character of the Estimate. It was concerned solely with expenditure on warlike operations and the winding up of those operations, and had nothing whatever to do with the expenses of the future administration of the country, for which a separate Vote was being asked in the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates. The hon. Member was also in error in estimating the cost of the war to the British Exchequer at £3,500,000; the actual total cost did not exceed £2,500,000. The total war expenditure for which the Foreign Office was responsible was £73,640, while the war expenditure incurred by the War Office since they had had control of the operations was £252,000 in 1902–3, £1,618,000 in 1903–4, and £550,000 in 1904–5, or a total of £2,420,000.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) asked whether that was inclusive or exclusive of the appropriations-in-aid.

*EARL PERCY said that amount included the whole of the military expenditure, but it did not include the expenditure under the head of grants-in-aid which had been asked for year by year.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said the question of the hon. Member opposite was not as to grants-in-aid, but appropriations-in-aid.

*EARL PERCY said he had answered that question by saying that the figures he had given represented the total expenditure on military operations.

An hon. Member pointed out that on April 23rd, 1903, the present Marquess of Salisbury stated that the expenditure of the Foreign Office on military operations was £89,000, not £73,000.

*EARL PERCY said the figure given him was £73,000. But even taking the higher sum the total would not be much more than £2,500,000. But the hon. Member had not confined himself to the policy of the War Office; he had roamed at large over the policy which led to the war, and the policy of the Government now that it was over. Those who had listened to this and recent debates would naturally infer that His Majesty's Government had been the first Government to set foot in Somaliland, and that they were actuated in that policy either by a desire for military adventure or by quixotic philanthropy. The hon. Member for South Manchester, who had made one of the most useful contributions to the debate, pointed out that two totally inconsistent arguments had been advanced by the mover and the seconder of the Amendment, and the same inconsistency had run through many of the speeches delivered from that side of the House in the course of past discussions. The Opposition had two favourite theories in regard to this matter. One was that the Mullah was a harmless fanatic who might very well have been left to his own devices, and who would have given no trouble if he had not been interfered with. At the time the campaign against him was undertaken, he was actually in occupation of the whole of the eastern portion of the British protectorate, and was seizing all the property of the agents of the Administration. The wife of one of our agents was divorced from her husband by the Mullah, and appropriated to himself. Hon. gentlemen could not find language strong enough to denounce the conduct of Mahomedan peoples in parts of the world for which we had no direct responsibility, but when outrages were inflicted upon people who were under our protection they described them as the methods of a revivalist and temperance reformer. The second theory was that the Foreign Office was mainly to blame for the extent to which we had become involved by not taking the advice of their military advisers soon enough. There was no foundation for that suggestion. An expedition was first recommended by Consul Sadler in 1899, and preparations were at once made, but the Mullah withdrew. On his reappearance in 1900 the force was again collected, and with this force Colonel Swayne advanced in 1901 and inflicted three signal defeats on the Mullah at Ferdiddin, Sanala, and M'Neill's Zariba. It was withdrawn because the Mullah had retired to Muduc in Italian territory, where we had not then permission from the Italian Government to follow him. In 1902 he resumed the offensive, and the Expedition, under Colonel Swayne, met with a severe check at Erigo, where complete disaster was only averted by the pluck and gallantry of the Yao troops. The conduct of the operations then passed from the Foreign Office to the War Office. He did not therefore feel called upon to discuss the strategic policy adopted in the later stages of the campaign.

Earl Percy.

The hon. Member made it a special ground of censure that the Government had invited the co-operation of the Italian Government instead of calling upon them to keep their own tribes in order; but his facts were inaccurate and his proposals impracticable. The Mullah's following, including as it did the Dolbahanta and Aligheri, was not derived wholly from the tribes in the Italian sphere; and the Italian Government had never professed to exercise administrative control over the *Hinterland* of their own territory. They had not undertaken the same obligations to the tribes in their Protectorate as we had to the tribes in ours. We only invited Italian co-operation because, the Mullah having retreated into their territory, it was necessary to prevent him from escaping southward and menacing our Protectorate in East Africa. The object being to hem in the Mullah, we attempted to achieve that result by a simultaneous advance from Obbia and Bohotle in co-operation with an Abyssinian advance from the West. It was quite true that this attempt was not completely successful, in the sense that it did not result in the capture of the Mullah, but it enabled us to inflict the crushing defeat at Jidballi, which finally destroyed his effective power, dispersed the great majority of his followers, and has secured the Protectorate from attack ever since.

He would only say one word more upon the question of policy. It seemed to be imagined by some hon. Members, and was actually stated by the hon. Member for the Elland Division, that the whole of this forward policy on our part might have been avoided if we had been content with more modest measures of a purely defensive character upon our own frontier, That policy was tried in 1901 and reconsidered in 1902, but was abandoned because it would have involved the occupation of a stretch of country 500 miles in length, and the establishment of a permanent garrison of 10,000 men. Now that the Mullah's power had been destroyed the defensive policy had been partially adopted. As to the objects of the war, we had not desired to acquire territory. We had gained nothing in that way; but we had kept something, which, if we lost, we might say "Good-bye" to the idea of governing native tribes at all—the reputation of being faithful to our engagements. Supposing that the Government had made the original miscalculation alleged by the hon. Member, what had that to do with this Vote? The hon. Member for Bristol said that the Government had spoken of this as a military promenade, but he did not recollect any one making use of an expression of that kind.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I quoted that expression from the first White Paper presented to the House, and it was used by the Consul-General.

***EARL PERCY** said he was under the impression that the hon Member was quoting from a speech made by the Prime Minister, and he concluded that he meant to imply that the Government had misled the House.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: But I gave the name.

***EARL PERCY** said he apologised to the hon. Member, if he had misunderstood him. Admitting that the Government, acting on the advice of their local officers, who were best able to form a judgment upon the matter, had made a miscalculation, if this were a just, necessary, and inevitable war, then the fact that His Majesty's Government did not know how much it would cost had nothing to do with the matter. If it were an inevitable war the Government was bound to spend the necessary money to see it through, whether they underestimated the total cost in the initial stages or not. Was it a necessary war? The war was mainly undertaken to defend the tribes in our own Protectorate with whom this country had entered into distinct treaty engagements. Some hon. Members had discussed the origin of these treaties, and assumed that they were made by the Foreign Office—another instance of that peculiar administrative incompetence which was supposed to characterise the Department he represented, a Department which seemed to him to have been most unjustly and most unfairly criticised in the past. The Foreign Office was not originally intended or framed for the purpose of undertaking administrative duties of this kind, but as a matter of fact he doubted very much whether any Department could have so rapidly improved the financial *status* of any one of the Protectorates under the charge of the Foreign Office as that Department had done. It was assumed that these treaties were made by the Foreign Office and by a Conservative Administration. Neither of those hypotheses had the slightest foundation in fact. Not one of the treaties with the tribes in Somaliland had been made by the Foreign Office. Every one was made by the India Office, and out of the nine, six had been made by the Party opposite, and he thought the majority of them when Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): The conditions have been entirely altered by the extension of the protectorate.

***EARL PERCY** said the whole of these treaties had practically the same character; they were general treaties extending to the tribes the protection of His Majesty's Government. He did not know that it was necessary or very relevant to this discussion to enter upon a defence of the original policy of these treaties. Everybody knew that they were the consequence of our occupation of Somaliland and that occupation was dictated by various considerations of the intimate connection at that time between Somaliland and Abyssinia on the one hand, and on the other the Upper Nile Valley where we had not yet established our position—and the importance of Berbera, both from its situation on the high road to India, and from its convenience as a provisioning basis for the garrison at Aden. The value of Berbera from that point of view depended entirely on our being able to keep open the trade routes to the *Hinterland*. There were three ways in which that object might be achieved. We might have undertaken the whole expense and responsibility of administering the interior ourselves. No one had suggested that we ought to have adopted this course. We might have armed the tribes so as to enable them to defend themselves against the Mullah, or we might have adopted the policy, which the Government did adopt, of restricting the area of our administrative responsibilities, and whenever it became necessary to undertake the defence of the tribes to do so by means of punitive expeditions. The Government may have been right or wrong to fall back on the third policy, but theyadopted it on grounds of economy. But whether it was right or wrong, there can be no doubt whatever that, having adopted that policy, and having entered into engagements with the tribes, we were bound to carry them out, and all the more bound for two reasons. In the first place, it was largely owing to the fact that we had made these treaties, and that the tribes relied upon us to protect them against attacks by the Mullah, that they had refused to make common cause with him. Another and even more cogent reason for our intervention was that we had deliberately disarmed all the tribes under our protection, and had therefore left them defenceless against the neighbouring tribes who were in possession of arms. In the opinion of the Government no other course was open to them than that which they had adopted unless they were prepared to plead *force majeure*. To admit that they were unable to carry out their treaty engagements would have been a confession humiliating in itself and would have had a most disastrous effect on the neighbouring tribes. It was a confession which the Government were not prepared to make; and he did not believe that in this matter hon. Members opposite would have followed a different course themselves. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife had never associated himself with the attacks which came from hon. Gentlemen opposite. In the debate on April 30th, 1903, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "It is perfectly true that the undertakings deliberately given by this country to savage or semi-savage tribes under our protection must be rigidly, honourably, and even scrupulously observed, and it is immaterial what Government is in office at the time."

He turned now to the question of our policy in the future. No doubt the situation had changed. In performance of our treaty obligations we had incurred great expenditure both of money and life; and it was open to us, he thought, now to reconsider our position. He had already briefly outlined to the House the three main policies open to the Government originally. They chose the one which they thought would involve the least expense. As a matter of fact, the policy of punitive expeditions had proved in this case, as it had proved over and over again on the Indian frontier, the most extravagant policy which we could possibly pursue. It was not recognised when the treaties were concluded in 1886; but the Government had now come to the conclusion—a conclusion which he thought had been pressed upon them by all sections of the House—that the wisest and most prudent policy to pursue in the future was to limit our administrative responsibility as far as we possibly could to the coast line. But there was a corollary to that policy, and that was that we should arm the tribes and organise them so as to be in a position to defend themselves in the event of any future emergency such as that with which they had been recently confronted.

Sir ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): Do you adhere to your obligations?

*EARL PERCY said there was no question of repudiating our obligations; it was only a question of devising means to carry them out.

SIR ROBERT REID: Does the noble Lord mean that in future this country is both to undertake their protection and to defend the tribes by arms, or are they to defend themselves?

*EARL PERCY replied that he could not say what action in each individual case future governments might think it advisable to adopt, but the Government did not repudiate the general obligations into which they had entered with the tribes in Somaliland. This policy, however, of arming and organising the tribes so as to enable them to stand alone was obviously one which would take a little time, at all events, to carry out. They could not expect tribes never armed and never organised before to be in a fit position to defend themselves at once. Besides, therefore, lending the assistance of political officers for the purpose of controlling the organisation, the Government proposed to provide the requisite stiffening of Regular troops during the interval. They intended, in the first place, to bring the 6th battalion King's African Rifles, which had been seriously depleted, up to its full strength, and to transform it from an infantry into a mounted regiment. In future it would consist of 200 mounted Somalis and a camel corps of 300; and it would represent the permanent garrison of the protectorate. It was further proposed temporarily to locate in the protectorate the 33rd Regiment Punjabis for one year, after which it was hoped that the tribes would be in a position to resist any attack brought against them with the support of the permanent garrison.

There was one other measure they thought it necessary to adopt. It was desirable to strengthen our administrative hold on the coast and to take fresh measures for the control and suppression of the arms traffic which had been responsible for much of the difficulty we had had to encounter in the past. Some hon. Members who had spoken in previous debates had rather implied that the dangers of this traffic had entirely escaped the attention of the Government. That was not the case. During the whole of these operations the Government had devoted the most anxious consideration to every possible method for suppressing it. There were three different sources from which a supply of arms could enter that region—from the coast line under British or Italian influence; from the East African Protectorate where it bordered on the Yuba River; and on the North-West across the Abyssinian frontier, from Harrar or Jibuti in the French sphere of influence. The Government of Zanzibar had since the commencement of the operations kept a very close scrutiny on the importation of arms, the German and Italian Consuls had agreed to exercise strict supervision over their own vessels, and the Governor of German East Africa also issued special instructions on the subject. Between Lamu and Kismayu there was an armed dhow patrolling the coast and a road patrol on the main routes from Yuba to the *Hinterland*. On the North-West the French Government had given orders that no arms were to be issued to natives under French protection. In Abyssinia, the Emperor Menelik very soon after the war commenced issued special regulations in regard to the sale of arms, having already, under the new regulations, seized a large consignment. No dealer was to be at liberty to sell arms, except under special licence, and no native might carry them without the permission of the Court. The British coast did not present so much difficulty as the Italian—it was so mountainous for 120 out of the 240 miles that, practically, the importation of arms across that barrier was impossible, and off the remainder of the coast we had four British men-of-war. The Italians had employed one man-of-war and one torpedo vessel. They had also established at Bundin Kassim one additional Custom-House station for the control of the traffic. In addition, the Italian Government had allowed us to search suspected vessels in Italian territorial waters, and we had also obtained the consent of the Sultan of Muscat, from which much of the arms traffic came, to search ships flying his flag, not only in Muscat territorial waters, but also on the high seas. We proposed in future to strengthen our administration of the coast-line and Somaliland by placing there two additional coast stations at Hais and Las Khorai, and also an armed steamer, the initial expense of which would be £9,000, part of which would be recouped to us by our being able to dispense with a dhow.

He could not give any precise information as to where the Mullah was at the present moment; he thought it was somewhere near Illig. In conclusion, he hoped the measures now contemplated would commend themselves to the House as measures which would effectively carry out the declared policy of the Government to restrict the responsibilities of this country in future within the narrowest limits, and that in their effort to suppress the arms traffic they would continue to have the support and assistance of all the neighbouring Powers in Africa, to whose rule, no less than to our own, this traffic was a constant and dangerous menace

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that the defence of the policy of the Government in Somaliland just made by the noble Lord was very characteristic of all the previous defences of the same policy and of the same Government. The latter part of the speech of the noble Lord gave away the first part; but that was also characteristic of deliverances from the front bench opposite. In the first part the noble Lord stated that the Government had embarked on this expedition in Somaliland because they wanted to prove to everybody that they were a Government that kept their pledges. He did not say it was not necessary for this Government to give some such demonstration; but they might have done it in much better and less expensive ways and without spending two and a half millions of money.

EARL PERCY: How?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that there was the hon. Member for King's Lynn behind them; they might have kept their pledges to him, and no one thought that that would have cost £2,500,000. But having sworn to their own virtue, and having entered into treaties with the Dolbahantas and all these tribes, saying, "We will protect you at any cost," they now declared, "We have come to the conclusion that it is too expensive to keep our word." The hon. Member for King's Lynn would have this satisfaction, that he was no worse off than the Dolbahantas tribes, except in one respect, that the Government were going to arm the Dolbahantas. What an extraordinary position!

Earl Percy.

EARL PERCY: The Dolbahantas are not one of the tribes under our protection.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it did not matter; the Government were going to arm other tribes then. There were as many of these tribes as there were sections amongst His Majesty's Government's supporters. The noble Lord entered into a very elaborate argument to prove how very important it was to prevent the importation of any arms into that part of Africa, and then he said how very difficult it was; how there were mountain barriers along the Somaliland coast, how the Italian frontier was quite impossible, how the French were defending Jibuti, and how the Abyssinians were making arrangements to prohibit the entry of arms in some other part. In fact the difficulties were insuperable. But then the noble Lord went on to say that the Government were going to solve these difficulties. They were going themselves to supply the tribes with arms! The fiscal policy of the Government was difficult enough to understand, but their policy in regard to these tribes was still more difficult. First of all, their policy was to exclude arms, and they entered into engagements with the European Powers and with the Sultan of Muscat to stop all traffic in arms; and then, having broken their word to the Somali tribes, except the Dolbahantas, they proceeded to break their word with all the European Powers. Really the policy of the Government was becoming more and more perplexing from day to day.

The noble Lord said that the cost of this war so far was only £2,500,000. Millions were nothing to the Government; they just flung them away, and on a policy too which they themselves now acknowledged to be a failure. How did they start?—£80,000. The noble Lord said the war was inevitable. All the wars of this Government were inevitable. But not only the wars, but the miscalculations were inevitable. They had heard something of the sort before. £10,000,000 for a cheap trip for the army to Pretoria; £80,000 for an excursion to Somaliland, now run up to £2,500,000. It was the same thing in Tibet—just a few thousand pounds to leave the right hon. Gentleman's card on the Dalai Lama, Instead of that it was converted into a great military expedition. This was part of the policy of the Government; the only difference being that at last they had a Minister who said that the whole thing was a mistake and a miscalculation. He was glad that someone had acknowledged that. But what a position it was. They were dealing with a gentleman—a Mullah—he did not know what he was—he might be a revivalist,—but they did not send a military expedition to put down revivalists in this country. Why should they do it in another country? The Mullah was one day an Italian, the next day an Abyssinian, and another day a true Briton. He was just as elusive as the Prime Minister. But why should it be our job to deal with him at all? The noble Lord did not give the slightest indication of what he was going to do. Last year they were told that there was not going to be any more expenditure on this job; that the Government were simply going to negotiate with the Mullah. What had become of the negotiations? Why not send out the hon. Member for Central Bradford as a sort of envoy extraordinary to deal with the situation? It would be just as sensible a policy as that now being pursued. They had gone on year by year piling up expense; starting one policy, departing from it; entering on another, and departing from that. If the Government would only follow some definite line of action and put it through it would not be so bad; but they were simply doing nothing.

There was one point referred to by his hon. friend the Member for East Bristol which was not dealt with by the noble Lord. His hon. friend quoted from *The Times* newspaper a statement that the Mullah, at the present moment, had more soldiers with him than when he started.

Earl PERCY said that the latest information was that the Mullah had from 1,500 to 2,000 rifles.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that was more than he had when he started. What a remarkable state of affairs! After four campaigns to put down this religious revivalist the only result had been to increase his power. Of course, part of the £2,500,000 was spent in providing him with rifles. It was the only result of four years campaign. The noble Lord now wanted to start on another tack. Surely it was time that someone should be made responsible.

Earl PERCY said that what he stated was that it was a possibly true proposition that the original policy of entering into these treaties was a mistake; but that was a policy for which hon. Gentlemen opposite were more responsible than the Government.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that an attempt was now being made by the Government to repudiate responsibility for their own action. Someone must have been responsible; and the policy had been begun while the present Government were in power. They embarked on these series of campaigns; and they ought to be responsible and to accept the responsibility. They had irritated the tribes in such a way as to actually increase the power of the Mullah. Anyone reading the documents could see what had happened. These tribes were the prey of both parties. They were between the Mullah and the British forces. One day they were attacked by our forces and the next day the Mullah attacked them. We robbed them of their sheep and camels, and drove them from their wells. The whole expedition was a story of driving the Mullah from well to well, while we attacked tribes whom we had sworn to protect and whom we had entered into an engagement to protect. The result was that they were deprived of their means of subsistence and joined marauding expeditions under the Mullah or some other leader. That was the sort of policy the Government was pursuing, and which they would never pursue if they were at war with a civilised Power. Why in making war on semi-savages should the Government pursue a policy which they would not dare to pursue if they were dealing with a civilised Power? The noble Lord said that they wanted to show the Somalis that when the British swore to a thing they would stick to it; but was it not equally important to show them that we could carry out military operations in a civilised way. What the

Government had been doing was, not attacking the Mullah's forces, but attacking the tribes. That was very different. What were they doing now? They started, first of all, to pursue the Mullah. He left. Then they said he was done for. He turned up again with the April rains; he was attacked again; and then it was said he was no more. That was repeated three or four times and now no one knew where he was. That was very like the position of the Government. But really this was, after all, child's play. It was not the way to deal with the Mullah. They would not get rid of the Mullah by ignoring him. They could say that his power was at an end; they could even move the previous Question on him; but back he would come when the wells were full. They had had debate after debate in this House on this policy; and each time the Government had given a totally different explanation and a totally different reason for entering on it. The only thing they knew was that hundreds of thousands of pounds had been spent on a policy which was absurd. and which created a feeling of distrust in the minds of the tribes and also in the minds of the people of this country.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said he had the good fortune to be associated recently with an officer who was connected with the three campaigns in Somaliland, and who probably knew more about the country than any man in India or at home. The mistake which had been made by his right hon. friends on the Treasury bench was in abolishing the war before abolishing the Mullah. The Mullah being an ignorant man did not consider himself abolished; and was by no means an extinct volcano. He had always considered that there was no particular reason why there should be an expedition against the Mullah at all, except that he gave trouble some years ago. The Abyssinians attacked the Mullah; and the Mullah, instead of attacking the Abyssinians, attacked tribes on the coast who were under the protection of this country. Then came the three expeditions. The first was Colonel Swayne's, and if he had had 500 more men he would probably have finished the whole business. The war was conducted with the greatest economy; and Colonel Swayne did not do what he might have done under other circumstances. Then there were the expeditions under General Manning and General Egerton. Money was expended somewhat recklessly; and the war was brought to an end rather sooner than it might have been. Colonel Swayne was still in command and was holding a very extended line of communication 500 miles long; and the situation was very precarious indeed. The country itself was not worth holding. There was no transport and no water. It was, however, the entrance to Abyssinia and might be very valuable to us in the future. The road from Berbera ran straight to Abyssinia; and if this country abandoned it, no doubt our German friends would lay hold of it before we knew where we were. He always believed that the best policy was, instead of fighting the Mullah, to square him and make terms with him. The Mullah was what might be called a citizen of the world. He was once a cab-driver on the coast; and his word was not always to be depended on. He exhibited a considerable capacity for annexations which were not confined to gentlemen in Somaliland. He did not think the Government could be blamed for what they had done; they were bound to protect the tribes who were living under British influence; and if the expeditions had been more or less expensive, the Committee should remember they could not make omelettes without breaking eggs.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) complained of the way in which the natives of Somaliland had been victimised owing to the vacillating policy pursued by His Majesty's Government. That policy had been as unstable as water. At times it had been everything and at times nothing. When the Government came into power in 1895 they found a protectorate with a large revenue ably administered by the Indian Government with the tribes extremely loyal to the British Throne, and one of their first acts was to hand over a large number of the most loyal tribes to Abyssinia, an act which caused a considerable loss of prestige to this country and gave in consequence a good field for the Mullah to work on. The Government were warned that the Mullah, under the pretext of religion, had gathered a large number of armed men around him and that he was a dangerous man. They, however, ignored the warning, as in 1896 they ignored their responsibility in this matter, and allowed the Mullah to raid the tribes both on the coast and in the interior. The Government then commenced operations against the Mullah, but with as little foresight as in most of our expeditions in connection with the South Africa campaign. The result was disaster after disaster. Operations were commenced at the wrong period of the year, when there was no water and camel transport had to be depended upon. Mistake after mistake was made, and we finally found ourselves saddled with an expenditure of £2,500,000, as was admitted by the noble Lord. The noble Lord, however, had not contradicted the figures given on the previous evening, from which it appeared the expenditure was nearer £3,500,000 than £2,500,000. In reply to a question by the hon. Member for Poplar last year, the Secretary of State said the cost of these expeditions was £2,250,000, and we now had on the Estimates £550,000, in addition to which we had grants-in-aid of £159,000 and £76,000. Those amounts would add up to considerably more than £2,500,000, and he thought the Committee was entitled to a definite statement as to what the cost really had been. Thousands of lives had been lost, and now, instead of finding, as the Government did in 1895, a large number of perfectly peaceful natives, we found them armed by our own Government. Had the policy pursued by the Government been pursued by a Liberal Administration they would have been denounced as unpatriotic on every platform in the country. He wanted to see justice done to the natives when this country undertook certain responsibilities with regard to them. He wanted to see the natives properly treated, and did not want to see them armed one against the other. In his opinion the policy pursued by the Government had been most vacillating, and therefore he should vote for the Amendment.

*MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said he disagreed with the hon. Member that there was anything like lack of decision in the policy of the Government. The noble Lord had made quite clear to the Committee the policy the Government was about to pursue in Somaliland. He had been much struck by the speech of the hon. Member for Carnarvon, and it had occurred to him that some of the speeches made in that House were so eloquent and sincere that they made a trivial subject appear serious. Other speeches, delivered in a light-hearted way, made the more important subjects appear trivial. Such was the speech delivered by the hon. Member. He had never heard a more grotesque description of the policy of the Government. Nobody more fully recognised than himself how great the expenditure must be in this matter or how far short of our ideal our policy had fallen, but to put it in the way in which the hon. Member had done was to misstate both the ideal and the effect of the policy. The question was not one so much of expenditure as of keeping faith with tribes that were unable to protect themselves. For an Empire like Great Britain that seemed to be the foundation of our Colonial policy. When he heard the phrase of his noble friend "Imperial reasons" laughed at and scoffed at by members of the Opposition; when he heard the explanation of how the expeditions were delayed in 1899 and 1900 ridiculed below the gangway, and when he heard that phrase from the hon. Member for Essex "Somaliland is not worth holding," he thanked God that hon. Members opposite were not responsible for the Imperial government of the country. The Government had plenty to answer for, but they were not wholly responsible for the policy respecting Somaliland. The Opposition was responsible for six of the nine treaties that brought that policy about. The question of keeping faith with the natives was most important, but he was not perfectly certain that the Government had taken the right line in arming the natives. But what was to be done? In his view a punitive policy wit expeditions *ad hoc* was really the safest and the cheapest. We should certainly be paramount in Somaliland, not only in order that we could protect the tribes in the protectorate, but because of the influence it would give us with regard to the policy of Abyssinia. To retire from the *Hinterland* might have a very serious effect on our influence in Abyssinia; while, if the Abyssinians chose to imagine that we were hostile or weak, their influence on the Egyptian side might be more unfriendly than we cared to contemplate. He was not sure that the decision of the Government was a wise one, but at the same time he was convinced that the reasons put forward for the reduction of the Estimate were wrong, and therefore he should vote against the Amendment.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he had been a consistent, and he hoped as long as he was a Member of this House to be a persistent, opponent of expeditions of this kind, which in previous years he had predicted would end, as they had ended, in loss of life, diminished prestige, and a considerable depletion of the national treasury. The opponents of this policy cared nothing for the rebukes of the hon. Member for the Stowmarket Division after the harm had been done, what they wanted was that hon. Members should recognise the justice of their warnings, the prescience of their advice, and the lamentable financial folly which had resulted from the ignoring of both. The hon. Member had said that it pained him to hear Imperial obligations scoffed at, and patriotic policies jeered at. But people were now becoming sober, clothed, and in their right mind. The war was over, expeditions were disappointing to the taxpayer, and a well-informed electorate were getting tired of excursions which compelled even Gentlemen like the hon. and gallant Member for the Chelmsford Division to be bracketed with pro-Boers like himself for scoffing at the Imperial obligations so-called. The hon. Member for the Stowmarket Division was labouring under the common delusion of the Jingo, that mere expansion was Imperialism, that bigness was greatness, that recklessness was courage, and that invasion meant civilisation. There was no foundation whatever for that delusion, and he believed that history would prove that this country was never so great mentally, morally, and physically, as when it had few colonies, and little external territory, and its chief pride was the possession of strong men of good character and transcendent intellect.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): When was that?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I should say from the fifteenth to the end of the sixteenth century.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: England was then harrying the whole world.

MR. JOHN BURNS said that if the right hon. Gentleman would look up his own primers and histories he would find that, like the rest of the Government, he was directly contradicted when in office and in a hole by himself when out of office, and before the revised versions of his histories were put on the market. A statesman for whom he had a sincere respect expressed his view when, in speaking to Lord Cromer, he said there was a certain school of politicians whose object it was to try and annex the moon in order to prevent its being appropriated by the planet Mars. That statesman was Lord Salisbury, who in that matter thought Imperially in the best sense of the word. But if the Secretary of State for War would like an authority from the century he had just misquoted he could have one—

> "By all means it is to be procured that the trunk be great enough to bear the branches and the bough, that is, that the natural subjects of the Crown or State bear a sufficient proportion to the stranger subjects that they govern, for to think that a handful of people can with the greatest courage and policy in the world embrace too large an extent of territory—it may hold for a time, but it will fail suddenly."

That was written by Francis Bacon. But there was an even greater authority, and that was King Solomon, who, 4,000 years ago, adumbrated his colonial policy when he said to the Queen of Sheba, "The eyes of the fool are in the ends of the earth." The eyes of the fool had indeed been in the ends of the earth. The hon. and gallant Member for the Chelmsford Division had conveyed to the Committee the view of a distinguished soldier of experience and authority to the effect that Colonel Swayne might have finished the expedition if he had had men enough. Whose fault was it that he had not men enough? It was the fault, not of the House of Commons, but of those responsible for the expedition. If the Government were always going to advance civilisation on a powder-cart why did they not do it thoroughly as King Harry knew how to do it? Instead of that, the Government sent out expeditions imperfectly equipped and badly provisioned to a country of which the Intelligence Department knew very little, where food was difficult to get, and the water still more difficult to obtain, and where for only four or five months in the year it was possible for human beings other than Somalis to live. But the hon. and gallant Member had also stated that the place was not worth holding. He himself had made a similar statement in 1896 and 1898, and was in consequence called a Little Englander and so forth. But the hon. and gallant Member reverted to the modern Imperialism and said the country must be held because it was the straight road to Abyssinia. Surely the Government did not intend holding Somaliland as a base from which to walk the straight and narrow path into Abyssinia. If they did the Abyssinians would surely resent, resist, and defeat the attempt, just as they had resisted and repelled the Italians. But the excuse originally given for having anything whatever to do with Somaliland was equally preposterous, viz., that it was near Berbera, and that Berbera more or less commanded the high road to India, and that we had to look after the upper reaches of the Nile. He remembered the Chairman suggesting that any man who thought that either the west or east coast or the southern portion of the Soudan ought to be occupied to prevent some ingenious French engineer from diverting the River Nile at its lower reaches ought to be not in the House of Commons, but under detention, with the hon. Member for Central Bradford, in an institution maintained out of the rates.

The noble Lord at the Foreign Office stated that the Mullah had to be put down because he made war on the neighbouring tribes. If Great Britain was going to be arbiter in all inter-tribal disputes in the waste places of the earth, the annual expenditure on the Army and Navy would have to be not £70,000,000 but £170,000,000. It was urged that the Mullah seized the best men in the neighbouring tribes for military service. There were Members of that House who were in favour of seizing for compulsory military service the best men at home. He wished an expedition could be sent to incarcerate or suppress them, but that was no argument for going to war. The fact was that the so-called Mad Mullah was not half so mad as those who had attempted to catch him. The Mullah was where we were in the fourteenth century when we were making raids upon Scotchmen and Scotchmen were making raids upon us. The Scotchmen got the advantage and they had retained it ever since. The noble Lord the Member for Kensington said this country had gained nothing in territory, but we had gained something in prestige by showing the natives that we had kept our word. How had they done this? An expedition was sent out pledged to suppress the Mullah, but he was still at liberty, his prestige had been enhanced, and his power to raid had been strengthened by the fact that the British Government had been trying to suppress him for four years and had failed. The noble Lord stated that it was now the intention of the Government to stick to the coast line, and he hoped they would adhere to that simple policy. To talk of promoting peace in this territory by arming the tribes was one of the most contradictory things he had ever heard of. Just in proportion as they gave them arms of greater precision and sold them arms more cheaply they provoked wars, and far more serious wars than they would otherwise be able to wage with their primitive weapons.

The Government had pursued a sort of topsy-turvy Colonial policy which could not be justified by wisdom, ethics, or economy. Three nights ago the Irish Members asked the Irish Government to give them money for labourers' cottages and to simplify the procedure for obtaining them, but the Government replied that they had no money to give to the labourers of Ireland. When he heard that £2,500,000 had been spent on Somaliland he consulted the Blue-books and he found that in thirty years the Irish Government had spent out of Irish money only £2,000,000 in building 16,000 cottages for Irish labourers. With the money spent upon this wicked, foolish, and extravagant expedition they could have built 20,000 cottages for Irish labourers and allayed some of the grievances and much of the discontent which Nationalist Members spoke of a few nights ago. They had got many grievances at home. They had the unemployed at their gates and the poor existed in large numbers in every town and city. The Government had promised to bring in some proposal—probably a gingerbread proposal dealing with the Poor Law—relating to the unemployed question. Look what they could have done for our own poverty-stricken countrymen if they had had £2,500,000 to spend upon remunerative employment. "The eyes of the fool are in the ends of the earth," but the eyes of Britain, after these fat years of extravagance abroad and leanness at home, were at home. They saw now what the fiscal campaign had taught them. He appealed especially to the front Opposition Bench to remember this, because they were on the eve of taking office, and this would come about sooner than they were expecting. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"] Well, it ought to. He asked the House to remember that in twenty years they had had twenty wars and expeditions in twenty different parts of the earth. They had annexed 4,000,000 square miles of territory and brought 60,000,000 of subject races beneath our flag; and for the great loss of life all this entailed and the expenditure of £1,000,000,000, they had secured less international trade from those waste places of the earth than every year this country got from the city of Berlin or Paris, a trade which was obtained without the expenditure of a single £100 for soldiers or war material. If they wanted trade and commerce, the place to get it was not in the waste places of the earth. When he was a commercial traveller up the Niger he found that he could sell more goods for the Royal Niger Company when he took good goods, told the natives the truth, and dealt with them fairly, for then they came again. This Government was now blacking the eyes of its best customers in the four corners of the world, and they were wasting money upon military parades and fruitless expeditions where there was nothing to be got but discredit instead of rehabilitating the finances of this country from the material point of view. Morally this policy was damaging the prestige of the British Empire, which with all its faults was still the greatest Empire in the world; but it would not deserve or enjoy that reputation if it were governed by prancing pro-Consuls, who thought expansion was Imperialism and buccaneering civilisation, and who thought the way to increase our trade was to send expeditions to wild districts, where the natives considered themselves well dressed if they wore only a bracelet and a smile. Upon every count this Government stood condemned, but in nothing more than in the wanton waste and wicked extravagance to which it had subjected the taxpayers of this country. Now that the electorate was aroused and were thoroughly tired of these expeditions he trusted that the Government would give them an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion upon their conduct. When this opportunity was afforded he did not think that any of the acts of folly of the Government would be more strongly condemned than the foolish, extravagant Somaliland policy, which was a discredit and a disgrace to everybody who had had anything to do with it.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton said that behind Somaliland there was a great desert peopled by a number of wandering Arabs, who were divided into different tribes. He had read that these tribes indulged in stealing each other's camels. Because of this the Government came to the conclusion that we must occupy the *Hinterland*, and this was not the first time that this had been done. The same thing had happened in Uganda and many other parts of Africa. They had been told that Somaliland was a very valuable country, but that contention had now been thrown over by the Government, for they had been told in an official dispatch that the country was practically worthless. The more he heard of the Mad Mullah the more respect he had for him. He remembered talking to Ismail Pasha, who told him that they would always have these

Mullahs, and he said that he had had the honour of the acquaintance of nine different Mahdis when he was in the Soudan, if he might call making the acquaintance of a man having him hanged. Ismail Pasha told him that the English ought to give a little money to the tribes and make friends of them. In connection with these expeditions he should like to know about our agreement with Italy. These expeditions were not in our protectorate, but partly in that of the Italians. The Italians were the wisest nation in Europe. They cleared out of Africa as quickly as they could, and if we were to go to the Italian Chamber and ask for money for any of these operations the Chamber would absolutely refuse to give it. We had expended a considerable amount of money in Somaliland and destroyed a large amount of life. He wanted to know how in the name of wonder any Government could justify the agreement with Italy and the mode in which the agreement was carried out. Italy might have liked to have smashed the Mullah, but why in the name of wonder should we make an agreement with Italy? Having done so, we took in hand not only our own job, but the Italian job as well. This was one of the extraordinary illustrations of this Government always doing things in the wrong way. The outcome was that £3,000,000 had been spent there. Would anybody on the Treasury Bench tell him that that money was well and properly spent? The result was that we had made Christianity and civilisation odious in that part of the world by the way we had prosecuted the war. We had massacred the tribes. The Mullah had a better right to punish them than we had, if they were to be punished at all. The country belonged to the tribes. They had been there for countless ages. The Mullah seemed to have been an African Wallace in that part of the world, and he did not like the tribes taking our side. He thought the men who stood by the Mullah and did their best to repel our aggressions were better Somalilanders than the people we bribed to aid us in conquering that country.

The Government had an extraordinary method of meeting this; and most other criticisms. They were always throwing the blame on each other. He never saw such an unhappy family. Their first idea was, Whom shall we sacrifice? and over went Jonah into the sea. On the Government bench there would eventually be no one left but the First Lord of the Treasury, and he would have to perform the happy despatch. The Foreign Office made a mess of Somaliland, and they immediately put forward the War Office. The India Office had also had something to do with it. Each in succession had been a greater failure than the other, and the War Office under the auspices of the new Secretary of State for War appeared to have made a more thorough mess of it than anyone else. He employed more men, and announced that it would soon be over. Napoleon had appeared and the thing would be settled at once. It was settled in a practical manner by our clearing out of the place, holding only a small portion, and leaving this African Wallace, so far as he could see, more powerful than he was at the commencement of the operations. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs had told them that he was going to give up these punitive expeditions and arm the natives. Was there ever anything more abominable and scandalous than that we should arm the natives when we were parties to treaties preventing these men from having arms and preventing arms from being imported into Africa? How could they trust the natives who were to be armed? Did the Government really think if they wanted these arms back they would get them? They would have to undertake another punitive expedition to punish their own friends because they had turned against them.

How long was this going on? Was it not time that we had a definite policy in Africa? We had already a great deal too much of Africa. He wished we could apply to some foreign nations to take a great deal of it off our hands. When Germany gave us a portion of Africa we gave Germany the Island of Heligoland. If Germany would be in favour of taking the whole of Africa from us as a gift, he should be inclined to give the Isle of Man as well. What did Sir Robert Peel say to the Jingoes, the expansionists, and the Chamberlainites of his time? He said he was in favour of the expansion of the Empire and of obtaining territory where Englishmen could colonise, and live and thrive, but he believed that the more we took of those territories where there was a great native population, semi-barbarous, and where Englishmen really could not colonise, the more were we expanding our responsibilities, and the less were we gaining from that policy. That was his view of this African policy. He did not wish to go there to convert the natives. They had their religion, and we had our own. He had no more wish to convert them to our religion than that they should send Mohammedans here to convert us. Do not let us imagine that we were benefiting civilisation by committing atrocities in Uganda or Somaliland. War was carried on in those regions in a manner we would not dare to carry it on in any part of Europe. [AN HON. MEMBER: Poisoning wells.] The poisoning of wells was against the code of war. What was the difference between the poisoning of wells and the stopping of people who were likely to drink the water from coming near it? That was not carrying on war by civilised methods. His main objection to these expeditions was that they were an absolute waste of money, and heaven knew there were many social improvements for which we required money in England. When Gentlemen representing the Government came to the House two or three years ago and proposed any expenditure for the purpose of increasing armaments the House was ready to vote for it, and there were many on the Opposition side who backed them up. The people of this country—the Radicals of this country—had converted them. They now sang a very different tale. Now that the Liberal Party had acquired sounder views than they had two or three years ago—in fact had acquired his ideas, he might say—he heartily wished them success at the election, which he trusted would come as soon as possible.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said that he had listened to the debate with very great interest, but he was utterly in the dark as to what any Member opposite would have done had he been in power under similar circumstances. They had not, throughout all their criticism, given a single hint on that point. They had ignored the facts and tried to fix responsibility for what had occurred on His Majesty's Government alone. He happened to have been in the Foreign Office in India when the question of entering into relations with the tribes of the Arabian and African littoral were gone into and thoroughly discussed. It was needless to rehearse the reasons which existed then, and which existed now with still greater force, for the policy which was adopted. After close correspondence with the Government at home, the Indian authorities decided that these treaties should be entered into. As had been pointed out, they were concluded by the Party opposite in six cases; and three others were subsequently formed by the Conservative Party. Therefore what had been done was quite irrespective from any Party consideration at all. It had been the policy of this country equally pursued by both Parties. These agreements, having been entered into, certain responsibilities were incurred which this country was bound to abide by. These territories were looked after at that time by four British officers. He had been on the Somali coast and could speak from personal knowledge of the extraordinary manner in which those four British officers administered this protectorate, and the influence they were enabled to obtain over the tribes. Their administration would bear comparison with that in the neighbouring French territory, which was much less in extent but had a perfect army of officials, Judges, soldiers, and Custom-house officers. Those four officers established the most friendly relations with all the tribes and gained their complete confidence. Trade routes, which were formerly dangerous, became as safe as Piccadily; and trade, which had been to a large extent abolished, was re-established. In 1900 the volume of trade amounted to £662,000 per annum, but it fell to £487,000. In 1903 it rose again to £565,000 per annum. Well, into this protectorate, which had been so well administered by those Indian officers, came the Mullah, who raided the tribes, and indiscriminately murdered men, women, and children. Under those circumstances what would hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite have done? Putting all Party feeling aside, he did not believe for a moment that they would have said: "We will leave these tribes to their fate, the men to be murdered, the women to be carried away and the cattle to be driven off. We did not contemplate that when we entered into these agreements and now that they have become inconvenient we will repudiate them." He contended that everything which could be done to suppress the Mullah should be done. Very likely it might be thought that other means could have been adopted to put an end to the Mullah's raiding. But those means having failed, there had to be a resort to force. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would have found themselves in precisely the same position as the present Government. It was most regrettable that those things had to be done, but anybody who had been connected with the administration of native tribes on the Indian frontier or elsewhere, as he had been, must know that it would have been an absolutely fatal policy to desert the Somali tribes and show them that this country was unwilling to carry out its obligations and unable to protect them when we had promised to do so. The hon. Member for Battersea wished to revert to the days of the sixteenth century, when, according to him, we were confining ourselves to our own country, and not adopting any adventurous policy abroad. Why, those were the days of Raleigh and Drake and the Spanish Main, when we were the great raiders of the world and were laying the foundations of the great Empire the existence of which the hon. Member for Battersea now so much deplored. He held that if we were to maintain ourselves in Somaliland or on the Indian frontiers, where the conditions were much the same as in Somaliland, then we must adhere to our engagements.

As to the policy for the future forshadowed by the noble Lord, he understood that steps were to be taken to enable the native tribes to protect themselves. A great deal of irony had been expended on that policy. On the one hand, it was said the Government wished to keep arms out of the country, and, on the other hand, that they were going to arm the natives. He did not understand that to be the case at all. What he believed the policy to be was the same as that adopted on the North-West Frontier of India. In that region there had been for years and years expedition after expedition against the tribes. He himself was a witness of many of them, but it was found that that policy never led to wholly satisfactory results. It was then thought better to enter into political relations with those people, to appoint special Indian officers, and to arm the tribes so as to enable them to defend themselves from raids from outside. He understood that political officers—he trusted Indian officers—were to open negotiations with the tribes in Somaliland and to arm such numbers of them as they thought necessary to form, as it were, local levies in these territories under the supervision of Indian officers with subordinate native officers, as on the Indian frontier. By the expenditure of a small sum of money in that way he believed it would be found that these tribesmen could be taught to protect themselves from raids by the Mullah and his followers.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that the hon. and gallant Member had made some very interesting remarks, but had answered himself. The hon. and gallant Member asked the question what ought to have been done, and then went on to tell what had been done on the North-West Frontier of India. Why was not a policy similar to that applied every day on the North-West Frontier and other parts of the India borders carried out in Somaliland?

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON said it was all very well talking after the event.

MR. BRYCE said that the whole argument of the hon. and gallant Gentleman was that we had abundance of Indian experience extending over forty years, and the result of that experience and that policy was that the Khyberees and other native tribes found how much better it was to enter into arrangements with the British Government than to go on raiding. The truth was that the

Pathans on the North-West Indian Frontier were just as fanatical as the tribes in Somaliland and were even better men; and what had been done in the Khyber Pass and in Beluchistan would have done just as well in Somaliland. Why that policy had not been carried out in Somaliland was that the officers out there and the Government at home did not realise how valuable that Indian experience was, and how much better and cheaper it would have been to keep open the trade routes and subsidise the tribes rather than enter into treaties which led to these deplorable punitive expeditions.

EARL PERCY said that the Foreign Office had nothing to do with entering into the treaties with the Somali tribes.

MR. BRYCE said that he referred to what took place before the Mullah began his raids. That was the time when the steps ought to have been taken to which he had alluded. The noble Lord seemed to think that he shuffled off responsibility by going back to the treaties made some twenty years ago; but those treaties were not made by men who contemplated war. Those treaties were made by Indian administrators who knew how to deal with such people. Why were Indian methods not adopted so as to endeavour to obtain in a peaceful way what had not been accomplished after an expenditure of nearly £3,000,000. They could not have a more instructive illustration of the methods of the present Government, which had entered into this Somaliland War just as they had entered into the South African War. Their first estimate of the cost of the Somaliland War was £80,000, although there was another of £250,000; and their first estimate of the cost of the South African War was £10,000,000. Then, if they were going to send an expedition against the Mullah, why did the Government not give Colonel Swayne sufficient support? Very likely if they had the Mullah would have been disposed of. But the result of all these enormously costly expeditions was to increase the importance of the Mullah. The fact was that the Mullah had entered upon a species of holy war, which was conducted by Mohammedans against the people of other religions, in which every Moslem killed entered straight into Paradise. Therefore, the Mullah's followers had every inducement to carry on the war. He was sure the Mullah must have greatly enjoyed himself in continually getting away from our troops, who were merely idling. That was the way in which these continued expeditions were carried on. So far from the Mullah being destroyed, the fruitless expeditions had only given him additional credit in the eyes of the inhabitants. There was an instructive phrase in a report of Lieutenant-General Sir C. Egerton in which he said that the great thing would have been to strike at the Mullah's chief advisers and his bodyguard. If that had been struck at the Mullah's influence would have been gone. Now his bodyguard and his councillors were undiminished in numbers and he had maintained his credit in the eyes of his people. When he was last heard of the Mullah had 2,000 followers. He believed the noble Lord did not know where the Mullah was at present.

*EARL PERCY said he was understood to be in the neighbourhood of Illig.

MR. BRYCE said that that showed how little had been attained by the whole campaign. The Committee ought not to omit to notice what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon last year, because he presented an entirely different view to that given by the noble Lord. The right hon. Gentleman said that the position was not quite the same as was suggested, namely, that there was a large number of people under our protection who had been raided and massacred. His recollection, he said, was that a large portion of the inhabitants of that territory were rather in sympathy with the Mullah than with us. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that it was understood that when we drove the Mullah from certain territories we should consider our responsibilities at an end and would retire to our own territory, and by trade routes and perhaps railways extend our peaceful influence in order to counteract the Mullah's movements. It was apparently with that view that the right hon. Gentleman gave his consent to the operations. Now a bill was presented for £2,500,000 according to the noble Lord, but which his hon. friend estimated at £3,000,000. He himself was not satisfied with the noble Lord's figures; and he thought a case had been made out for showing that more than £2,500,000 had been expended. The result, however, had been nothing; and that was the material point. They had had four campaigns costing from £2,500,000 to £3,000,000 and there was no result whatever. They were exactly where they began, and were told in an easy off-hand way by the noble Lord that the war was inevitable. But a Government existed in order to foresee difficulties and to grapple with them. To be told that a Mohammedan fanatic had the power of putting this country to an expense of £3,000,000 and the loss of many precious lives was a test of the incompetence of any Government. The noble Lord did not state what he supposed the expense of the garrison and the other arrangements he described would be.

*Earl PERCY said he did not enter into details as he thought it was desired to discuss the general question. They were asking the Committee for a Supplementary Civil Service Estimate for £54,000.

Mr. BRYCE asked if that would include the military expenditure.

*Earl PERCY said that, in addition to the £54,000, they asked last July for £25,000, making a total of £79,000. That figure would be practically continued as long as the Punjabee regiment remained in the country. They only expected it to be there a year; after that they hoped the expenditure would be about £45,000.

Mr. BRYCE asked if that covered the cost of the coast arrangements.

*Earl PERCY said it covered everything.

Mr. BRYCE said it would probably cover everything until there was fresh trouble on the part of the Mullah. It might not turn out to be any benefit in the long run. If they armed these tribes, how could they tell how they would use their arms. They might sell their arms to the Mullah, or the Mullah might take them by force; so that he did not feel at all sure that they were promoting peace and tranquillity by arming these tribes. That was not what was done on the Indian frontier. He should like to ask also whether Somaliland was to continue under the Foreign Office.

*Earl PERCY said it would go to the Colonial Office with the other Protectorates on April 1st.

Mr. BRYCE said he hoped that the country would have a better future before it. The entire business was an illustration of the pretext so often used by the Prime Minister that it was necessary for the present Government to remain in power because it was the only Government that could manage foreign affairs. Could any Government have managed the Somaliland affair worse? His hon. friend the Member for East Bristol had rendered a service by moving his Motion. They had had an instructive debate, during which a great deal of light had been thrown on the policy of the Government. It was only £3,000,000; but it was the number of these little wars that contributed to the frightful increase of taxation which had taken place. Anyone either at the War Office, the Colonial Office or the Foreign Office who would set his face against these little wars would render a great service to the country.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he was glad that the right hon. Gentleman had in his closing remarks referred to the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Bristol, because he thought the hon. Gentleman had started the discussion on the right lines. He stated what was absolutely correct, that the retention of our hold on Somaliland was a strategic necessity. That dominated the whole discussion and was confirmed by many other hon. Members. If it were necessary in the national interests to retain control over Somaliland the only question that really arose was the extent to which our power should be exercised and the methods by which it should be exercised. A few speakers had thrown over any suggestion of that kind, and had let it be understood that our policy should be unconditional withdrawal from Somaliland. But that was not the prevalent view of the Committee. He noticed that the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Chelmsford Division, who criticised the action of the Government from some points of view, agreed with the view of the hon. Member for East Bristol. The only hon. Member who took a distinct line to the contrary was the hon. Member for Battersea. The hon. Member used some very strong expressions and went very far in his illustrations; but he himself was not so much moved or convinced by them as perhaps he ought to have been. He did not know whether the hon. Member remembered that this country spent £800,000,000 during the Great War; and that that expenditure gave it control of the highways of the world and practically made the British Empire. The hon. Member drew an idyllic picture of the peaceful conditions in the sixteenth century; but at that period this country was fighting in Scotland, in France, in Ireland, in the Netherlands, and had just founded the Colonies of Virginia and Newfoundland. The hon. Gentleman would have to reconcile these historical facts with his statements before suggesting a return to that period. The hon. Member for Saffron Walden Division did not contest what was said by the hon. Member for East Bristol that there was a military necessity underlying our action. The hon. Member for the Elland Division said that the Government ought to have been more provident; ought to have foreseen what was going to take place; and ought to have been more uniformly successful. He also said that the Government was incompetent to conduct a mission of this kind. That, however, was a matter of opinion. He could carry his memory back to another Government and another expedition. There was then also a fanatic who used his power and influence to the injury of this country. A campaign was undertaken; and he himself gave up contesting a constituency as a protest against it. Blunder followed blunder; there was great bloodshed which horrified the people of this country, and the end of it was the sorrowful tragedy of Khartoum. Osman Digna was a person who came, disappeared, reappeared, and against whom we had to use, often without success, the forces of the country. As often as he reappeared and used his power for ill-using those who relied upon us for protection, so often were we compelled to proceed against him. Osman Digna had now disappeared for ever, and we were reaping the reward of our insistence upon the policy then adopted, and when the hon. Member said that there was nothing to show for what had been done, he himself thought there was a strong opinion to the contrary.

Mr. Arnold-Forster.

He did not intend to enter exhaustively into this matter, because his noble friend had dealt with it so fully that it was needless for him to do so, but he would like to recapitulate what had been said, in case there were Members now in the House who had not had the advantage of hearing the lucid exposition of his noble friend. He would be as brief as possible. What were the facts? The beginning of this matter did not lie with the present Government at all. The beginning of our connection with Somaliland dated back to 1877, when the Egyptian Government gave us a right to regard certain ports on the coast as free ports. The next step was the withdrawal of the Egyptian Government from those ports. In the opinion of experts of that time it then became necessary for us to assume control over that littoral, and we proclaimed a Protectorate over Somaliland. In 1886 we made treaties with the natives of the littoral, and it was beyond dispute that the majority of those treaties were made by those who belonged to the Party to which hon. Gentlemen opposite belonged. Therefore, the responsibility for those treaties rested on both Parties, and the obligations, if obligations there were, fell upon both Parties alike. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen had asked why the Government had been unable to deal with the situation in Somaliland, where, as he truly said, they had established themselves by resorting to Indian methods of administration. He asked why they could not leave well alone and follow the example set by the Indian Government on the North-Western Frontier of that country. That was exactly what had been done; that example had been followed; Indian administrators administered Somaliland, and peace and order were conferred on that country. But the same thing happened there which had happened over and over again in India; it had often been the case that a long period of peace had been broken by unruly and uncontrolled tribes, influenced by a single man. That had been the case here. In the year 1889, an incursion into or invasion of our Protectorate was made by the Mullah. Hon. Members could not be deceived by descriptions which had been given of the Mullah, they all knew what kind of a man he was. He had been accurately enough described by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen as a Mussulman fanatic acting after his kind. He had also been described as an African Wallace. Exaggeration could go no further than that, and the comparison was a poor compliment to a gallant man. But these invasions not only jeopardised life, but led to loss of life and property as well, and no Government that ever existed in this country could afford to stand by and see such eruptions take place without taking any steps to stop them. The Government took steps to resist this invasion of our territory by means of an armed force. That force was not sufficient, and it was true the campaign was not uniformly successful, but he knew of hardly any British campaign that had been uniformly successful. He knew of some, but very few, and he did not think it affected the policy of the Government in any degree if, in some engagements, they suffered defeats instead of achieving victory. That was not the point, the point was to see the ultimate goal to which they were moving, the ultimate result of their policy. They had had reverses as he had said, but finally they had a success of great magnitude and drove the forces of the Mullah out of the country. That was the opportunity taken by the Government to bring these operations to a close. It would have been desirable to have captured the Mullah, and it would have been desirable in the case of Osman Digna, but they did not succeed in capturing either Osman Digna or the Mullah. What they did succeed in was in breaking his power and destroying a large number of those who were his principal adherents. It was a mistake to suppose that the Mullah's following was as large as when he commenced operations. It was not to be compared with the following which he had had many times since. That was the position to which they had brought this matter. They had only moved when compelled to move. They had done their best to achieve and had achieved success, and they had taken the first opportunity of ceasing operations in order to restore that condition of peace which was enjoyed by Somaliland before. Some said that the Government were not doing enough to carry out their pledges, others said they were doing too much; both these views could not be true.

The policy of the future had been explained by the noble Lord. He did not pretend that that policy could be a guaranteed policy, or could provide against all emergencies. It was said that they ought not to supply these natives with arms. But what was the alternative? They had deprived them of arms in the first instance, and they had now adopted the policy which they thought the breaking of the power of the Mullah had justified them in adopting. The result of the operations justified our remaining on the coast and replacing arms in the hands of the natives and restoring to them the right and power of defending themselves against possible enemies. They were entitled to know what hon. Gentlemen opposite conceived to be the duty of the British Government in a state of things of this kind. We were committed to retaining our hold upon this country and to protecting the interests of those to whom we were pledged by treaty. There were only two alternatives. Either we had to break the power of the Mullah, as far as we could, and, having done so, organise the country on Indian methods, by Indian officers, so that it might stand on its own feet for purposes of resistance, or we had to go out of the country and leave the whole of the people to their fate. He ventured to think that if hon. Gentlemen opposite were ever called upon to deal with this question they would do precisely as the present Government had done in the same circumstances.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that the right hon.

Gentleman compared the Somaliland operations to that of the Soudan. Nobody denied that there was not mess and muddle in the Soudan, but one would have thought that successive Governments would have learnt by the experience of the Soudan and would not have allowed a similar mess and muddle to have again occurred. As the result of the whole of these operations—the right hon. Gentleman did not deny that we had wasted between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000 — we were now, so far as Somaliland was concerned, in a worse position than when we started. The speech of the noble Lord the Under-Secretary of State provided the greatest condemnation of what the Government had done, because it showed that what they were now proposing was an absolute and entire reversal of the policy which they entered upon this time last year. The right hon. Gentleman asked hon. Members on the Liberal side what was their policy with regard to Somaliland. The policy which they ventured to suggest last year was the very policy the Government now proposed to adopt. It was therefore a satisfaction to feel that the Government had adopted the policy for which they had all along contended. On February 25th of last year the Secretary of State declared that nothing would induce him or the Government to withdraw from the expedition or their then policy, but within a few weeks the right hon. Gentleman wisely came to the conclusion that military operations ought to be brought to an end. The ground then given was that the Mullah had been defeated and was a broken force. But if that was the sole ground for the suspension of operations, surely now that the Mullah had a force of 2,000 riflemen and many thousand spearmen it was the bounden duty of the Government to send another expedition and break up that force. But, fortunately, the right hon. Gentleman had learnt by experience, and was now embarking on a wiser policy.

The whole argument put forward by the Secretary of State for War and the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in defence of these costly and badly-managed expeditions had been the treaties to which reference had been made. No doubt if definite treaties were made the obligations entered into must be duly observed. But these treaties had been put much too high. If the Government had known that the expeditions would cost so much money and lead to so great loss of life, he did not believe they would have adhered to their policy. If the noble Lord contended that the treaties imposed an absolute obligation to defend the tribes from attack, there must also be admitted an obligation to keep them under our ægis. Why, then, did the Government break their treaty obligations by handing over to Abyssinia against their will some of the most loyal of the tribes?

*Earl PERCY said the tribes referred to were not included among those with whom we had treaties.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON submitted tha they were included in the obligation equally with the others. If the treaties were to be used as an argument in one respect they should be used all round. The Under-Secretary also stated that in 1899 the Mullah was in actual occupation of a large part of our Protectorate, and yet the Government made no move in the matter until two years later.

*Earl PERCY said an expedition was organised in 1899, but the Mullah retreated.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON understood from the noble Lord's own account that the first expedition was sent in 1901. These alleged treaty obligations ought to have been discovered before and an attempt made to turn out the Mullah at the earliest opportunity. At that time the Mullah had a comparatively small following; he was in possession of the Protectorate, more or less against the will of the people, and a small expedition could probably have destroyed his force. But he was left alone for two years, and during that time, seeing that the British Government were taking no steps, the tribes naturally went over to his side, with the result that when, at last, an expedition was sent the Mullah's power was infinitely greater than before.

But what was to be done in the future? Apparently the Government intended to play fast and loose with the treaties. The noble Lord stated that whether or not the Government would assist or protect the tribes would depend on circumstances.

*Earl PERCY said that the manner in which our liabilities were interpreted would rest with the Government in power.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said that possibly that innuendo was added, but the noble Lord in reply to a definite question gave, as representing the Government, a definite answer in these words: "How far we should protect them or assist them would depend on circumstances." In his opinion, that was a very wise answer. But if it depended on circumstances, it was manifestly absurd to base the whole case for this waste of money on absolute treaty obligations. The history of the expeditions showed the shilly-shallying character of the policy pursued by the Government, the only redeeming feature in the whole business being the great gallantry of both white and native troops in the face of most difficult circumstances. In regard to the future, the Government had admitted that they had reversed their policy. He was afraid that the difficulty of carrying out this policy would be infinitely greater now than it would have been at the beginning. The country had been disturbed and largely ruined and the Mullah was still at large. Somaliland itself was in a very bad way financially. This country would have to bear the cost not only of these military expeditions, but the cost of a large garrison, and there would probably be further Supplementary Estimates. This was another object-lesson, of which they had had a great many examples, in the policy of opening up these wild regions too rapidly. He objected to the policy, which was initiated by the right hon. Gentleman. the Member for West Birmingham, of increasing the liabilities of this country in the wilds of Africa, and attempting to carry out our policy quicker than ordinary conditions permitted, with the result that we were landed in this great expenditure.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that at first they were told that this expedition to Somaliland was only going to cost £80,000, but they had now been informed that it would cost nearer £3,000,000 than £2,000,000. He had always complained that such expeditions were useless and expensive.

He wished to ask the responsible authorities what steps were being taken for preventing horses being brought back to Ireland with disease. He urged the Government to take all possible steps to see that these animals from foreign countries which accompanied the Army did not introduce into Ireland any of those diseases which were so injurious to horses. He noticed in *The Times* a paragraph stating that the Marquess of Waterford had been obliged to destroy two valuable horses because this South African disease had broken out in his stables. The paragraph went on to say that this disease was brought to Waterford by the artillery horses after the South African campaign. That was a most serious state of things. At the present time people were afraid to drive into Waterford for fear of this disease, and if the veterinary authorities of the Army had destroyed all those horses upon landing in Ireland they would have prevented this epidemic. In the interests not only of Ireland, but of all classes of the community, it was necessary that some steps should be taken to prevent the spread of this disease. He hoped the House would be assured that effective measures would be taken. The apprehension in Waterford was serious and almost approached to consternation, and it was the duty of the War Office to see that this evil was not allowed to increase.

*Mr. MARKS (Kent, Thanet) said the principal objection to the policy of the Government in Somaliland appeared to be that they had met with less success than had been anticipated, and that the Government were not justified in sending out an expedition. The reasons had already been pointed out why the expedition had had less success than was at first anticipated, and it had been shown that the troops had had to face more than ordinary difficulties on account of the configuration of the country. But those reasons hardly went to the root of the matter. If a nation, having a just and good cause for war, was to be deterred on account of the character of the country or the difficulties to be encountered, the whole history of the world would have been changed. How would England have fared if during the South African War we had abandoned our policy because of the difficulties which our troops met with by reason of the existence of kopjes behind which the Boers concealed themselves? How would the United States have acted in the Modoc Indian War when they found the enemy hiding themselves in the lava beds of Oregon? The great consideration the Government had to bear in mind was not the ease or the difficulty of operations, but the justification for undertaking them. He contended that this debate had shown that the Government had every justification for engaging in the Somaliland operations. Having escaped the just penalties of his conduct the Mullah was now held up as a sort of hero, and if he had met the fate he deserved no doubt he would have been held up as a martyr. However that might be, it was interesting to note that, on this occasion at any rate. the conduct of the Government had not been criticised on the other side without some suggestion of an alternative, and in that respect the debate differed from some they had had. A very definite alternative had been offered by the hon. Member for Northampton, who said we should invite Germany to take over the whole of our possessions in Africa, and that we should throw in the Isle of Man. That might have the effect of saving us some money, but he did not think it would commend itself to the Government. He did not think it would make for the reputation or safety of the Empire Certainly it would not improve our reputation for good faith towards the tribes with whom we had treaties. It was a policy which he was confident would not commend itself to the House. It was a policy which might be left to the Gentlemen opposite who hoped shortly to succeed the present Government.

*Mr. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.) said several speakers on the Government side of the House had complained that no alternative policy had been offered from his side. The policy of the hon. Member for Northampton did not count at all. Speaking for himself he ventured to suggest a policy. They had in the Mullah one very much in the nature of Sir Antony MacDonnell. The Mullah was a distinguished Oriental administrator who did not get on with His Majesty's Government, and worst of all he would not resign. He suggested that the Government should adopt something of the policy with regard to the Mullah which they were adopting with regard to Sir Antony MacDonnell. and that was to recognise him and make the best of him. It had been done already by another European Power concerned in the territory. Italy had recognised the Mullah and come to some arrangement with him. It had been done before by this country on many occasions. For years we fought the tribes in the Khyber Pass, and eventually we came to an arrangement with the tribes and allowed them to keep arms on condition that they would keep the Pass open. That policy had been crowned with complete success. He suggested that as an alternative to the policy which the Government had been pursuing. He congratulated the Government on the loyal support they enjoyed from such Members as the hon. Member for Stowmarket and the hon. Member for Stepney. They supported the policy of disarming the tribes and promising full protection, and now that the tribes were to be armed and the promise of protection withdrawn the Government would receive their support, although they might consider the new policy not so good. He was not so happy as these hon. Members. He wanted to know a little more about this *volte face* of the Government. Their policy had been to prevent arms of any sort from going into the country, and now they were to have free trade in rifles. It seemed that there was to be a bounty-fed importation of rifles. Were they going to give the natives the discarded rifle of the British Army, or the new short rifle? Were they to be armed with artillery, and, if so, would it be quick-firing guns? Last of all, he should like to know who was to be the organiser of victory for these unfortunate tribes? Who was to be the Carnot of Somaliland? The noble Lord the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs sat with a great War Minister on each side of him. He would suggest that as we were breaking our word with these tribes the least the Government could do would be to send out one of these great War Ministers to organise them. *Pacta serva* was the motto on which the Empire was built up. It had been said that the moment we broke our promise it was goodbye to British supremacy in that country. He asked the Committee to think of the effect on India when it became known that we had withdrawn our protection from those tribes, and left them to protect themselves with such rifles as we put into their hands.

Sir ROBERT REID said the ground taken by the Government was that we were under obligations to these tribes, and that the expeditions had been carried out with as much foresight as could be expected from the Government. It seemed to him that his right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen and others had very largely broken down that contention. There was no doubt of any sort or kind that the danger which had been injudiciously handled was a danger which had arisen from the making of these treaties. There was no doubt that within the last twenty years about a quarter of the present British Empire had been added to the Empire. It might be a right or a wrong policy, but all those expeditions, and accompanying and subsequent expenditure, were due to the policy of the Government. If the policy of extending the area of the Empire was pursued, the country must be prepared for this excessive expenditure. It was perfectly idle to make treaties with these semi-savage tribes in dark continents and not expect to pay heavily for it. For his part, he believed that such a policy was unwise. He was most sincerely desirous of maintaining the British Empire as it was, and of strengthening it, but they were pursuing a fatal course, and impairing their resources, if they continued to follow out the lines which necessitated this huge expenditure. That was the real moral to be drawn from the history of these expeditions. Some day the people of this country would not be prepared to pay this expenditure. They would contrast the millions that were squandered in all parts of the earth, in building railways here and sending expeditions there, with the difficulty of obtaining money at home to extend the natural facilities of the country and to improve the condition of the people. It was somewhat revolting so see money squandered abroad with freedom, and when some money was wanted for schools or for benefiting the poorer classes of the nation in dire necessity, the Treasury was obliged to show the greatest reluctance in granting it. It was time that hon. Members should turn their attention to the moral of these expeditions and see that the expenditure of these vast sums of money was due to unwise policy.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) said that one thing had been made clear in the course of the debate, and that was that the policy the Government had pursued in Somaliland had been a lamentable failure. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs had admitted to the House and the country that the Government contemplated a complete reversal of their recent policy in Somaliland. One defender of the Government supported the change of policy on the ground that a similar policy pursued on the North-West Frontier of India and the Khyber Pass had proved eminently successful. But he would remind the Committee that that policy was in full operation on the North-West Frontier long before the Government undertook any expeditions of a military character in Somaliland. He remembered passing through the Khyber Pass twelve or fourteen years ago and he found it defended by a rifle corps levied from the tribes in that district. That corps had preserved order and tranquillity to a large extent, and if they had enjoyed proper support and the confidence of the Government in the last struggle that arose in that district they would have proved themselves able to repress it. Only after they lost that confidence had the troubles spread and the Government of India been put to a large expenditure. The Committee was face to face with the fact that though the Government had extravagantly spent £2,500,000 of the money of the taxpayers of this country in military operations in Somaliland, no one could confidently say that the difficulties and troubles had been ended. He had been recently in those regions and others adjacent and had had the opportunity of meeting military men and civilians well acquainted with Somaliland, and from them he learned that there was a great fear that the present situation was full of great peril and difficulty. The £2,500,000 had been spent in an absolutely futile manner. When regard was had to the vast responsibilities of the British Empire all over the world, when the national expenditure had gone up to the extent of £50,000 000, when the need was great for care in the distribution of the national expenditure, why should £2,500,000 be spent in Somaliland, where the interests of the British Empire were merely visionary? At the same time troops—both cavalry and artillery—were being withdrawn from Egypt and the Soudan, thus creating a situation which might be fraught with serious peril.

Mr. SECRETARY ARNOLD-FORSTER rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put. "

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 278; Noes, 222. (Division List No. 30.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bagot, Cap. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. (JManch'r.)
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T .
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon, St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Chamberlain, RtHn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Ed. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar, Sir T. R. (TowerHm'lts
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, RtHn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzgerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, SW
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredrk.
Gordon, Hn. J E. (Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'r H'm'ts
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords. N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herb. Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry

King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawson,Hn. H.L.W.(Mile End
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks. NR
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt. Hn. Sir Fredrk. G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R.F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir Harry S (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith,RtHnJ. Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart,Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester).
Talbot,Rt. Hn JG (Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col. Sir CEH(Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir WilliamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A.C.E (Taunton
Welby,Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E,R,
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,SirW.H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Chales P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptEC(S Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hammond John
Hardie, J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jocoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork.)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir CharlesM (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, SirR.Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, T. (W. Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts , John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt HnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse,SirJT. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. Causton.

Question put accordingly, "That Item Vote 1, Sub-head BB (Somaliland Expeditionary Force) be reduced by £10,000."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes, 278. (Division List No. 31.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Cap.E C(S.Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J.M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)

Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Thomas (W Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestershire, N.
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. Sir H
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r.)
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col H.F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J.A. (Glasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J(Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHn J.A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower H'm'ts
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir. J (Man'cr.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R.B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs.
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredrk.
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords. N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. J. Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir J. (Monm'th
Lawson, Hn. H.L.W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. NR
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Fredrk. G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Samuel, Sir Harry S(Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Rt. Hn. J. Parker(Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und-Lyne)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes

Mr. SECRETARY ARNOLD-FORSTER claimed, "That the original Question be now put."

Original Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 273; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 32.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt Hon Sir H
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Cavendish, V. C. W(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hn. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredrk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E(Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D(Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbur)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Mar. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynemouth
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir James (Staffords NW
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham

Hozier, Hn. James HenryCecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir JohnH.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo.T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hn. Col.W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawson,Hn.H.L.W. (Mile End
Lawson, John Grant (YorksNR
Lee,Arthur H. (Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C (Cumb., Eskdale
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott(Hants)
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir Harry S (Limehouse
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col Sir C.E.H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-ColA.C.E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir CharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, RtHn. HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,Capt EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick

Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander(Lanark,NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Chas. Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kempe, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accringt'n
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, SirCharlesM. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, SirR.Threshie (Dumfries)
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L (Cleveland
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn CR. (Northants.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir JT(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

PREFERENTIAL TRADING WITH THE COLONIES.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): I have to ask the indulgence of the House to enable me in the shortest possible time and in the fewest possible words to discharge the duty which the caprice of the ballot has imposed upon me. The Motion which I have placed upon the Paper refers to the proposals of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, proposals which were declared by the right hon. Gentleman to be urgent two years ago, and which have ever since agitated the country, the Cabinet, and the House of Commons. I will not take up the time of the House in arguing whether this is a Party question or not. I have noticed that whenever a distinguished politician declares that a particular question is above Party, what he really means is that everybody, without distinction of Party, shall vote for him. But I think it is incumbent upon me, as the mover of this Motion, at the very outset to acknowledge the admirable temper and calmness with which the great self-governing Colonies of the Empire have watched the development of this controversy, and also to acknowledge with gratitude and respect the correct attitude which has been maintained under very difficult circumstances by colonial statesmen, and particularly by those who are concerned with Australia and Canada. They have made it clear that they wish Great Britain to decide this question upon its merits and as may be found good for the people of this country. They have shown the strongest dislike of being drawn into the arena of British politics. They do not intend to allow themselves to be made counters in the game of any political Party. They repudiate altogether the unworthy suggestion that they wish to make a profit out of the wages or the sufferings of the poorest classes in this country; and they have made it plain that the decision of this country, whatever it may be, will not influence, in an adverse sense, that Imperial sentiment of comradeship and loyalty which has marked the happy development of our colonial policy during the last two generations.

The Motion refers specifically to the protective taxation of food. It does not make any special mention of—though, of course, it does not exclude—the taxation of raw material. That is because the right hon. Member for Birmingham has complained frequently that he is misrepresented when it is suggested that his plan would involve the taxation of raw material. I have no wish to misrepresent the right hon. Gentleman. But I submit to the House that there is no logical or scientific distinction between the raw material of manufacture and food, which is the raw material of human life. No scheme of colonial preferences could be a scientific scheme unless it applies equally to food and to raw material. That is equally true whether the question is argued from a free-trade or a protectionist point of view. Every argument, moral or material, that can be advanced in favour of the preferential taxation of corn, meat, and dairy produce holds good, even in a stronger degree, in favour of the preferential taxation of timber, leather, and wool. Any system of Imperial preference which includes the one and excludes the other must be lopsided and illogical in its conception, and whimsical and unfair in its operation. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham has spoken scornfully of the attitude of the Opposition with regard to the proposed Colonial Conference. The right hon. Gentleman has declared that to invite the Colonies to join us in a Conference, and to tell them beforehand that we are not prepared, whatever may be the result of their deliberations, to propose protective taxation on food is an insult to those great Colonies. Yet, at the same time, the right hon. Gentleman himself invites the Colonies to join in a Conference, and tells them beforehand that, whatever may be the result of their deliberations, he is not prepared to propose to this country protective taxation on raw material, and that it is a gross misrepresentation to suggest that he is. The right hon. Gentleman's argument appears to be that, if the Conference was called, prejudiced beforehand in respect to the taxation of food, it is an insult; but that if it was called, prejudiced beforehand in respect to the taxation of raw material, it is a wise and prudent act of Imperial statesmanship. Really, the right hon. Gentleman should give the country a better argument than that.

I venture to draw the attention of the House to another point which is, in my opinion, fatal to the symmetry of the proposal that the right hon. Gentleman has put forward. He has forgotten India. Nothing reveals more clearly the genesis of the right hon. Gentleman's scheme than the neglect, in his argument, of the great dependency of India. I have always believed that it was not an Imperial but a Departmental plan; it comes from the Colonial Office in Downing Street. It springs, not from the perception of any natural principle, but from the reflections of a Minister who has been called upon over a number of years to deal with those particular duties which happen quite arbitrarily to be allocated to the Colonial Department. If, for instance, we had followed a different arrangement, if we had grouped together in one great Department all the duties which concerned the King's dominions beyond the seas, which would be a perfectly scientific and logical method, instead of splitting them up into India Office, Foreign Office, and Colonial Office, and if the right hon. Gentleman had been the head of that consolidated Department, it is inconceivable that in the scheme he puts forward India would not have occupied a much larger place. The right hon. Gentleman could not then have forgotten that India takes of our goods two-thirds as much as all the self-governing Colonies together, that she imposes no hostile tariffs—[An Hon. Member : 5 per cent.]—no hostile discrimination against our goods, which is vital to Lancashire, and that she contributes so vastly to our Imperial defences. The right hon. Gentleman could not have forgotten, if I may quote words which have been used in this House before—

> "That most truly bright and precious gem in the Crown of the King, the possession of which more than of all your other Colonies or great possessions raises the reputation of these small islands above the level of the majority of nations and of States, and places them in a position of equality with and possibly even of superiority over the greatest empires of ancient or modern times."

We have to face the concrete proposals which the right hon. Gentleman, with all his candour and precision, has placed before the country. I would remind the House that they consisted in a 2s. duty on corn and 5 per cent. on meat and dairy produce. I am not going to argue this evening as to who is likely to pay those taxes if they were imposed; the very word preference means better prices, and if it does not mean that it is a sham. And if it does not mean that, and if concessions are to be obtained from the Colonies upon it, it is a fraud on those Colonies from whom concessions would be obtained under false pretences. But the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, and those who act with him, a more or less numerous body in the House—[a cheer]—not a very stentorian response—has admitted that the taxes he proposes would have the effect of raising the price to the consumer of corn and meat in this country—he admitted it when he neglected to include maize and bacon in his proposed fiscal taxes. The right hon. Gentleman showed by that surprising admission what his own opinion was of the real incidence of these taxes, and he showed also that he would make a very much better free-trader than he is ever likely to make a protectionist. But the main argument against these preferences is not the prices resulting from them. If the taxes are large the rise in price would be very large, and if they are small the rise would be small; and these are very small taxes. They are not large enough to alter the social and agricultural conditions of this country. They do not touch the fringe of the grave problems of rural depopulation and physical degeneracy; but they are large enough, perhaps, to somewhat increase the severity of existence upon the very poorest of the people, and they might, though that is doubtful, put small and fleeting profits into the pockets of some landowners and substantial farmers. ["No."] Not even that?

The main argument against these taxes is based on a great principle, which is that this country should be free to purchase its supplies of food wherever it chooses and whenever it chooses in the open markets of the world. That is a principle greatly valued in the House of Commons, for which on this side every Member is prepared to make the greatest exertions, and for which on the other side of the House some Members have already made, and are still prepared to make, sacrifices, for which, I believe, their countrymen will not be ungrateful. It is a principle of special importance to Lancashire Members, who, travelling from one great city to another, see in every valley of that undulating region towns and townships which are the homes of a vast thriving population living on a soil which could not support in decent comfort a twentieth of their number. I have been told that within thirty miles of the Manchester Exchange—I might say of the Free Trade Hall—there is gathered together the greatest concentration of human beings on the surface of the globe. This mass of people are absolutely dependent for the food they eat and the material they employ upon supplies which reach them mainly from foreign lands. They are dependent on the condition of a crop at one end of the world and the state of a market at the other; and yet, upon this artificial foundation, through the inestimable advantages of unfettered enterprise and of unrestricted sea communication, they have been able to build up a vast industrial fabric which, it is no exaggeration to say, is the economic marvel of the world. They have had lately rather an unpleasant experience in Lancashire, a shortage of cotton and a "corner" following thereon. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham has reminded us piously that that shortage was due to the act of God; it is not, like the Sugar Bounties Convention, due to the wisdom of a paternal Government. But what is the remedy proposed for that state of things? It is to vary and multiply the sources of cotton supply so that, when there is a bad harvest in one place, good crops in another may repair the deficiency. But if your preference is effective, and in so far as it is effective it must tend to limit and localise the sources of supply, and to make them more and more dependent upon a single source of supply.

At present we stand on very firm ground in respect to food. With the telegraph and with steamships there is hardly a food-exporting country in the world that is more than sixty days from Liverpool. The harvests of the world are at our disposal, and by the system which averages climatic risks we secure not merely a low but a fairly stable price. With that marvellous operation by which the crowded population of this island is fed we cannot take the responsibility of interfering. There will be good years and there will be bad years. Great fluctuations must necessarily occur from time to time in all commodities which depend upon climatic conditions; they have occurred in cotton, in corn, in sugar; and the right hon. Member for West Birmingham reminded us the other night they are now occurring in onions. It is quite true that the workings of nature are beyond our control. There are many factors in prices—harvests, freights, speculations—which do not recognise the authority of the House of Commons. Taxes alone are absolutely in our own hand. These fluctuations have occurred in the past; no one can doubt that they will occur in the future. Whatever rise may take place in the future the preferential duties, if imposed—although, perhaps, only a small contributory factor to the rise—will have to bear the brunt of public indignation. It is upon these very links of Empire so laboriously and expensively forged that the direct impact of public displeasure in times of scarcity must inevitably descend. If there is an unpopular tax to-day we are in no great difficulty. If public opinion is sufficiently incensed a pliant Chancellor of the Exchequer, or, failing that, a vote in the House of Commons, will remove the cause of offence and gratify the national will. But these preferential duties, if they are imposed, will not be taxes which the House can remove at its pleasure. They will be fixed by treaty with every self-governing colony scattered all over the surface of the world. In consideration of these taxes this country will have received concessions—though that is not a part of the argument we hear much about—with regard, say, to certain classes of manufactured goods. Upon the basis of these mutual concessions industries will have grown up, and, however fierce the demand, you will not be able to alter your preferential duties without the consent of the other party to the bargain. In that day there will, indeed, be a shock to the permanent unity of the Empire which may well excite the concern of those who care about it. In that day, when a British Ministry with taxes which it cannot remove without a long delay is confronted by the imperious demand of a hungry and an angry electorate, you will realise the truth—perhaps to be denied to-night—that it is a grand and cardinal error in Imperial statecraft to lay the foundations of a democratic Empire upon the protective taxation of food.

It is a sober fact that the British Empire produces within its limits every commodity which luxury can imagine or industry require. I do not wonder that many hon. Gentlemen have been captivated by the idea of creating a self-supporting and self-contained Empire. I frankly admit myself the fascination of the idea—until you look into it. Then it is apparent—though this, of course, is disputable—that it rests on no moral, logical, or scientific foundation. It does not make for prosperity, it does not make for international peace. The dangers which threaten the tranquillity of the modern world come not from those Powers that have become interdependent upon others, interwoven by commerce with other States; they come from those Powers which are more or less detached, which stand more or less aloof from the general intercourse of mankind, and are comparatively independent and self-supporting. Quite apart from the economic argument, which on this side we regard as sanctioned, we do not want to see the British Empire degenerate into a sullen confederacy, walled off, like a mediæval town, from the surrounding country, victualled for a siege, and containing within the circle of its battlements all that is necessary for war. We want this country and the States associated with it to take their part freely and fairly in the general intercourse of commercial nations. We do not mind even if we become dependent on foreign nations, because we know that by that very fact we make foreign nations dependent upon us. These, Sir, in brief and scanty outline, are some of the heads of a few of the principal and more obvious arguments which may be adduced in support of the merits of this Motion.

Before I sit down I wish to say a word or two on its terms. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham has raised this great new controversy. He has declared that it is urgent and that it is vital to the future of the Empire, and he has announced that he will devote to the prosecution of this cause the life and strength which we all, without distinction of Party, hope he may abundantly enjoy. This is not the first time the right hon. Gentleman has abandoned great office and high authority for the sake of the opinions he has held. Those who disagree with him most flatly, who feel bound to meet him with the most unrelenting and most unwearying opposition, do not undervalue the advantages which such conduct in public men confer upon the dignity and standards of our Parliamentary life. But we have a right to hope that the right hon. Gentleman will adopt methods that are worthy of the high motives with which he is generally credited. I appealed to the right hon. Gentleman some days ago privately, and I now urge him publicly, to use the influence which he possesses with the Government to secure for the House to-night an unprejudiced decision upon this great question. I can only regret greatly that the right hon. Gentleman does not take that view of his obligations. At any rate, the position of the Opposition is perfectly clear. This Motion has been drafted with one object and one object alone. It has been drafted to encounter in terms not of prejudice but in terms of candour what we conceive to be the main proposition of the policy of Imperial preference. The Motion contains no censure, expressed or implied, upon the Government. It cannot injure the Government unless they, in defiance of their pledges, place themselves directly in the path. It is not aimed at the Government; it is aimed there. [The hon. Member indicated Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.] The Prime Minister has declared that he will not propose the policy of Imperial Preference until it has been ratified by two successive victorious general elections. Why then does he now intervene with the previous Question. Is he not a little late with his previous Question? Would it not have been much better to have moved it, not in the House, but in the Cabinet two years ago, when the right hon. Member for Birmingham first raised these new and sudden proposals? We are, of course, in the hands of Government. If they chose to invade what is really a discussion between private Members on both sides of the House by the influence of the Party Whips, we, at any rate, cannot be accused of moving a vote of censure upon them. It is quite clear that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham does not agree with the Government. He resigned because he did not agree with them. He knows perfectly well that the word "Conference" will not unite him to the Prime Minister, because the Conference which the Prime Minister proposes is a two-general-elections Conference, and the right hon. Gentleman has declared that he does not approve of that, and that he thinks that one victorious general election ought to decide the battle. Furthermore, the right hon. Gentleman declared as recently as Friday last that the policy of Major Noble, which was the policy of His Majesty's Government, was marked by excessive timidity, and he intimated that he regretted it as injurious not merely to the Unionist Party, but to the fortunes of the British Empire. With what consistency then, not to use a provocative word, can the right hon. Gentleman shelter himself on Wednesday night behind that very policy of delay and ambiguity which he criticised so strongly on Friday? How can the right hon. Gentleman expect a poor wretched candidate in the country, who wants to get into Parliament, to face the storm—and it is a storm—when the leader of the movement, the man who has announced that he will devote his life to the cause, does not hesitate to take refuge on every occasion when there is an attack in this House behind the Government breakwater, which in fair weather he despises? I go further, and say—after all, these are matters which concern Gentlemen opposite—that large causes can never be advanced by small Parliamentary manœuvres, and no man can hope to convince the conscience and intellect of the nation when his first step must be to paralyse and to prejudice the judgment of the House of Commons.

The decision which we would take to-night, I suppose, cannot in any case be regarded as final. The present Parliament has witnessed the raising of this controversy, a controversy which has divided friends, broken up a Cabinet, and has, I am assured, though perhaps this will be denied, inflicted some injury upon a great Party. Our responsibility as a Parliament in respect to this controversy is real and grave. Courage and honour alike forbid us to repudiate it. It will be a reproach, and an abiding reproach, upon us if we melt away to the constituencies without having had the pluck or honesty to give a plain and candid answer. It may not be in our power to undo the harm that has been done; it may not be in our power to knit again what has been sundered; we cannot expect to end this long campaign in a single engagement; but it is within our power, and it is certainly our duty, by our vote to-night to erect and establish a sign-post of warning and instruction for the guidance of Parliaments to come. On these grounds, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, "That, in the opinion of this House, the permanent unity of the British Empire will not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the protective taxation of food."

*Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Resolution which has been submitted to the House in the brilliant speech to which we have just listened has my support for more than one reason. In the first place, it has my support because Members on this side of the House can speak and vote on this particular issue without the slightest impeachment of Party loyalty. That has been made perfectly apparent recently by correspondence affecting the seat of my noble friend the Member for Greenwich. Then this Resolution has a primary merit in that it offers to the policy of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham a direct challenge. Of course, that challenge may be evaded, other circumstances may intervene, but as long as it is on the floor of the House and holds the field it is a challenge to the policy which has emanated from Birmingham. What is that policy? I have studied the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman with some care for the last two years, and as far as I can interpret them the right hon. Gentleman says to his fellow-countrymen, "Unless you are prepared to don the livery of the commercial bargainer and say to the rest of the Empire, 'We will put on something that we may take off something, that we may give you something, that you may give us something" why then we cannot reckon upon the permanent cohesion of the British Empire." That is a position which I, for one, desire to see absolutely shattered at the earliest possible moment.

Then, Sir, a second merit which this Resolution has in my eyes is that it takes us back to the very root of the fiscal controversy. It plants us at the point and on the plane from which the controversy originally started. It lifts us out of the region of what I may, perhaps, without offence, call the merely parochial side of this question, as it effects the internal industries of the country, and rivets our gaze upon its wider and Imperial aspect. That ought to make it exceedingly grateful to the right hon. Member for West Birmingham and his followers. I welcome it because, though on that side it is infused with considerations of Imperial sentiment which to a certain extent may confuse the judgment, yet the issue is perfectly plain here between free trade and protection. There is no question here of the abatement of high and hostile protective tariffs by retaliatory duties. The object sought by this policy cannot with any accuracy be described as freer trade, but rather as a transfer of trade. What is aimed at is, to transfer the trade now done between the Empire and foreign counties and to convert it into terms of inter-Imperial trade between the component parts of the Empire. From that point of view these hostile tariffs are a blessing in disguise. If we had not got them we might have been confronted with a great deal more foreign trade than we have to-day. What an alarming prospect from which we have been delivered by America, Germany, and France! All that we have to do now is to emulate these countries by an Imperial tariff which will further assist in strangling the trade of the Empire with foreign countries, and then the task which the right hon. Gentleman has set himself will be more easily accomplished. The object aimed at by the right hon. Gentleman is not freer trade; it is monopoly. We have great free markets in the British Empire. I do not allude to India, Hong-Kong, the Straits Settlements, Ceylon, the West Indies, or West Africa, because the position of these great markets in the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman has never yet been accurately defined. But England, the great free market of the world, is no longer to be free. It is to be a monopoly of the Colonies, and the Colonies on their part, by raising their tariffs against the foreigner, are to become the preserves of the mother country. There is one great factor in the problem which has always troubled me, and that is that one-half of our mercantile tonnage is exclusively engaged in trade between one foreign country and another. From the right hon. Gentleman's point of view that is obviously a nefarious proceeding; it is really engaged in a clandestine trade; but if we abandon free trade, and with it our power of cheaply constructing mercantile tonnage, that is a problem which will shortly cease to trouble us.

There is one other point in the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman which also has given me great searchings of heart. No one will deny the extreme lucidity of speech possessed by the right hon. Gentleman, but on one point I have not been able, and I think others have not been able, fully to fathom his meaning. Is what he proposes a series of commercial bargains, or is it a covenant of mutual sacrifice? At times the right hon. Gentleman has spoken in one sense and at times he has spoken in the other. One day we are exhorted to make great sacrifices for Imperial sentiment, and the next he regrets that there are no sacrifices he can call upon this country to make. But it is perfectly apparent that in the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the *rôle* of the mother country is to perform a function towards the Colonies akin to that which the Central Governments in Austria, France, and Germany have performed to the growers of beet sugar. We are to have a bounty upon the production of cereals, live stock, and dairy produce in the Colonies, because a tariff is a bounty, but in a more vicious sense. In the case of a tariff the consumers pay, and in the case of a bounty the people pay through the Government of the country. *De facto* there is no distinction. Having got rid of restricted areas of sugar supply by means of the Sugar Convention, as a free trader I intend to vote against a scheme for the creation of restricted areas of wheat supply in the British Empire. The growth, culmination, and decay of great empires is a subject of surpassing, and sometimes melancholy interest. Sometimes they have had their origin in a moment of religious enthusiasm, sometimes they have developed along the lines of peaceful and commercial intercourse, some have been carved out by the sword, and welded together by blood and iron. It has been reserved for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to conceive the idea of unifying a great Empire by the simple expedient of a corner in wheat.

If on free-trade principles I am against the right hon. Gentleman's scheme, I am also against it on the ground of practical expediency. The British Empire is a maritime empire. That is a fact which is sometimes conveniently ignored by the advocates of tariff reform. They seem to think that the British Empire, like Antœus, derives all its strength from contact with mother earth and its industries. In reality it draws its vitalising energy from the sea—the high road of all nations, yet the peculiar domain of one. Therefore, in considering questions of Imperial policy, surely our Navy the commerce it guards should be the objects of primary consideration. These islands form only one per cent. of the area of the Empire, but to-day they bear all but one per cent. of the cost of the Navy. I submit that, if it is open to the Colonies to say they will not advance along the path of Imperial union by shouldering the burdens common to Imperial defence, it is open to us in this country to say, without being subject to the charge of disloyalty to the Empire, that we will not advance along the path of Imperial union by running the risk of impairing our productive efficiency. I trust we shall be allowed to-night to take a direct vote " Aye or No " upon this simple issue. The wish of the Member for West Birmingham is that the country should be consulted as to whether it is for or against the taxation of food before negotiations are entered upon with the Colonies. That, at any rate, was his opinion on May 28th, 1903, and I assume it to be his view to-day. If the country is to be consulted, why not the House of Commons? The only reason I can imagine is that the House of Commons does not represent the country, an argument which will hardly be advanced from the Ministerial side of the House, and which, in so far as it affects me personally, I entirely repudiate. The question is—are we to go to our constituents with our minds unmade up upon this question? Are we to go to them with the words of the Eastern poet upon our lips—

> " There was a door to which I found no key;
> There was a veil past which I could not see;
> Some little talk a while of me and thee
> There seemed; and then no more of thee and
> me."

I think that that is an attitude unworthy of a great representative Assembly. We shall be dealing truly and fairly with our Colonies in letting them clearly understand what we think upon this question. Their attitude has been scrupulously exact. It is for us to define ours; and it is because I wish it defined by the only Assembly which has authority to define it that I second this Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That, in the opinion of this House, the permanent unity of the British Empire will not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the protective taxation of food."—(*Mr. Winston Churchill.*)

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): The brilliant speech of the mover of this Resolution described the attitude of the Government as timorous, and complained most vehemently that the Government and my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham would not look into the proposals which have been before the country for a considerable time. I venture to think that that is not a correct description of the attitude of the Government. The attitude of the Government in this House, as the result of a long and fruitful discussion on general principles, is that it is time to cease the discussion of abstractions, and definitely to ascertain in a businesslike spirit the exact proposals which the Colonies are willing to make to us, to discuss them with an unbiassed and unhampered mind, and to endeavour as a result to arrive on concrete proposals at what is the real truth and substance of the case. I think that he who enters into discussion freely and fearless of the result cannot be accused of timidity. On the other hand, he who has so little confidence in his principles as to think that free discussion between the parties interested can lead to no good has more right to be taunted with timidity, seeing that he is afraid to put his opinions to the true test. The policy of the Government, as announced on more than one occasion, is to enter into a conference with the Colonies with a free and unfettered mind. I thought the great majority of the House, including the Opposition, were in favour of a free and unfettered Colonial Conference, and I would remind the House that in 1906 a conference will take place. The effect of this Motion, if accepted, would be to attach conditions to the Conference between the representatives of this country and the representatives of the Colonies.

In the first place, I say, broadly, that to attach any fetter upon discussion is undesirable. But it is doubly undesirable to attach a condition which is in itself ambiguous. I say that deliberately, because the last words in the Motion are "protective taxation of food." If you took any twenty men in the House, indiscriminately chosen, I venture to say that you would not get from any two of them similar opinions as to what protective taxation of food means. We had in the course of the recess many speeches from the hon. Member who moved the Resolution. The information he possessed was freely given to the public, it might even be said copiously given, and many of his points were given with great lucidity. I cannot say that I have read all his speeches, but I have had them condensed into an encyclopædia, and certainly some of the headings in that encyclopædia are distinguished for plainness and lucidity. I do not think, however, that I got from it any very clear and definite definition of protective taxes on food. But let me ask a question or two upon that point. Is there any clear definition of what a protective tax on food is? Is it to be called protective taxation of food to propose a uniform import duty on all commodities? To say it is is to condemn the fiscal system of India as protective. I am not using the argument in a provocative sense, but to show that different meanings are attached to the word protection. The fiscal system of India has been controlled at different times by two such stalwarts as the noble Lord the Member for Ealing and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton. Now, in India there is no Excise, and practically the Indian fiscal system is a uniform all-round duty upon all imports. In this case there appears to be a difference as to what protection means. Then, again, I ask if the shilling duty on corn is a protective tax. ["Hear, hear!" "Yes."]

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he considered that a protective duty was anything which imposed an artificial discrimination between one class of producer and another.

*MR. LYTTELTON: I suppose that under that definition the shilling duty would fall. I think I have heard all the perorations of 1846 refurbished to denounce the proposal of my right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol with reference to the Corn Tax. But I will not elaborate this; I have gone far enough to show that different people attach different meanings to the word. In the first place, then, the Motion will cause embarrassment among those who vote for it, and, in the second place, it will have a very bad effect indeed in the Colonies. The Resolution of 1902 which was passed by representatives of the self-governing Colonies is familiar to the House; it was a unanimous Resolution recognising the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and the Colonies. Are we prepared to say that we will rule out from discussion by a conference the question of how to carry into effect this general principle? Would they rule out of discussion absolutely such a topic even as a shilling duty on corn? ["Hear, hear," "Yes."] Certainly there are few on my side of the House who will agree with that opinion. Surely it would be better, as the matter has been discussed at very great length as regards general principles in the last two years, that when representatives are appointed to discuss this question, among others of high importance, that the representatives shall enter the discussion free and unfettered. Surely, from the point of those who like and those who dislike colonial preference this must be so. My noble friend the Member for Greenwich has stated that he does not believe in any form of colonial preference, because in his view it would be a source of discord and not of amity. But, holding that view, he stated the other day that he could not oppose a conference. So clear-headed a man sees that if his case is right, the freer the discussion the better for truth. My right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham, who believes that in the principle of colonial preference there lies one of the greatest and finest ideals that has ever been proposed, is also in favour of the conference. Therefore, we have two honest, vigorous, and, of course, pre-eminently able men approaching this subject from opposite points of view, both equally confident and tenacious of the view which they hold, and both bold and courageous therefore in demanding that this matter should be submitted to a free conference, so that the truth may be ascertained. Both believe that their own opinion will be corroborated by further knowledge. I venture to say that we ought to seek the truth in this matter in the most excellent way. After a certain period surely it is not profitable to continue an abstract discussion. We should get the people who are interested in the matter together. Let us learn all the facts. Let us get out of a bewildering and endless maze into the safer region of a concrete proposition. A very distinguished man, well known to many hon. Gentlemen opposite, a very great lawyer and brilliant, wise, and witty man, Lord Bowen, once said to me—

> "A man of talent is a man who makes up his mind aright when he has got all the facts before him. A man of genius is a man who generally makes up his mind aright when he has only some of the facts before him."

I venture to think that the hon. Member for Oldham and his friends arrogate to themselves the claims of genius. They wish to make up their minds, and, more foolish still, they wish the Government to make up their minds, before they know all the facts, and when there is a proposal before them by which they can learn the facts. Is there a better way of learning the facts than by people who are anxious to make a bargain for their mutual advantage meeting together and discussing the whole matter? No one has suggested a better method of getting at the facts and of placing them clearly before the people of this country and people in the Colonies.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the offer?

*MR. LYTTELTON: I have never said there was an offer. I have said that the Colonies, especially Canada, New Zealand, and Africa, have given us that which is better than any offer—they have given us actual preference. The Premiers of all the self-governing Colonies have passed resolutions in favour of preferential tariffs and, so far as I know, they uphold the idea of a Colonial Conference. To my mind it is better that we should get to close quarters with actual proposals. It is not reasonable to expect us to give either a definite "Yes" or a definite "No" in the course of a three hours debate on a proposition which I have tried to show, notwithstanding the interruptions to which I have been subjected [Cries of "Shame"], and which, I venture to say, I have proved to be ambiguous even in the estimation of the hon. Gentlemen who sit opposite. It being, as far as I understand the cheers heard, agreed that it is desirable that the conference shall take place, most Englishmen wish that conference to be free; and nobody, not even hon. Gentleman opposite, wish it to be futile. But if we impose a condition such as that in the Resolution we prevent freedom, and if we impose an ambiguous condition we ensure futility.

I wish to imitate the commendable brevity of those who have preceded me, and I have only just a word more. This Motion, in my opinion, is not candidly or *bona fide* meant [Cheers, and some OPPOSITION cries of "Oh"] to clear up, but is intended to obscure the issue. It is not intended to strengthen, it is intended to weaken and invalidate the Colonial Conference. It is a device not to elicit the truth, but to mislead the unwary. It is impossible to affirm it or to deny it without giving to unscrupulous persons their opportunity, and its confessed ambiguity makes it liable to be misunderstood, and certain to be misrepresented. In these conditions, I have not the slightest hesitation in moving "That this Motion be not now put," and, so far from that being a Parliamentary manœuvre, it is precisely the occasion and the exigency for which this previous Question was intended, and it is precisely in order to meet tricky manœuvring that this Parliamentary weapon is forged. In saying "tricky manœuvring" I perhaps use too strong a phrase. [Cries of "No."] I do not mean to apply it in any offensive sense to the hon. Member who moved the original Motion. What I wish to point out is that, though I do not blame him for laying us a trap, I should blame ourselves were we to fall into it.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Question be not now put."—(*Mr. Lyttelton.*)

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON (Middlesex, Ealing): I have listened with interest, but with regret, to the speech of my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary. The Colonial Secretary, speaking, if my right hon. friend will excuse me for saying so, with a very limited Parliamentary experience [Cries of "Oh"], stated that the previous Question is a Motion which has been used in order to meet Motions of this character. I venture entirely to traverse that statement. The previous Question is a legitimate weapon of Parliamentary warfare, and Governments have had recourse to it under very exceptional circumstances. But I will undertake to say that neither my right hon. friend nor any one on the Treasury Bench will be able to cite a case where the previous Question has been used in connection with a Motion, made by a private Member, of a perfectly simple and straightforward character. The only occasion on which a Government has ever made use of this weapon has been where the Motion was either obnoxious in itself or invalidated or anticipated proposals which they intended to lay before Parliament. Then it is a perfectly legitimate proposition. My right hon. friend told us that the Government had got certain proposals as regards an Imperial Conference. But the House of Commons is not seized of this matter. We know absolutely nothing about it. Where is that proposition made, and who makes it?

MR. LYTTELTON: The Prime Minister made it at Edinburgh.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The Prime Minister made a most admirable speech at Edinburgh, because in it my right hon. friend repudiated the principles of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. A few days later my right hon. friend the Attorney-General, speaking at Inverness, put on that Edinburgh speech exactly the same interpretation which I have put on it. Yet my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham, writing to the gentleman who is standing for the constituency of Ealing, stated that there was no difference as to principles between himself and the Prime Minister, though there is a certain difference as to methods. But what did the Prime Minister propose at Edinburgh? Apparently he proposed that there should be an unfettered Conference between this country and the Colonies. But is this country, the predominant partner in the Empire, to give no expression whatever to its opinions upon the questions which are to be discussed at the Conference? Are the Colonies going into the Conference in the same way? Surely it is perfectly childish to maintain that the colonial representatives will not go into that Conference hampered. Every one who has studied the matter knows perfectly well that, however desirable might be the high ideal of trying to establish closer and more satisfactory relations between this country and the self-governing Colonies, there are two serious obstacles in the way, differing in their character, their origin, and their object. We in this country are free traders, the self-governing Colonies are protectionists. This country objects to the taxation of food; the Government and my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham object to the taxation of raw material. But what are the views of the Colonies? They have behaved right through in a perfectly straightforward manner. All the Colonial Ministers who have spoken on this subject have declared in the clearest and most emphatic terms that they will not agree to so alter their tariffs as to allow British manufactured goods to compete with the products of their own industries.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I beg my right hon. friend's pardon. Has he any proof of what he says?

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Mr. Fielding, of Canada, speaking at the Conference of Prime Ministers, distinctly said—

> "There must be no misunderstanding; we are not going to allow British goods to compete with ours."

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Of course I absolutely accept my right hon. friend's good faith. But what I want to point out to him is that at the last Conference of Colonial Prime Ministers, over which I presided, Mr. Fielding and the Canadian Minister alluded to were perfectly ready to review and revise their tariffs so as to see whether they could not—[OPPOSITION cries of "Order," and "Speech."] I am perfectly in order—in order to see whether they could not give us not only advantages against the foreigner, but give us also advantages with regard to the tariffs which affect British goods.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: My right hon. friend's explanation does not really traverse the statement I have advanced. Mr. Fielding, introducing the Budget of 1903, frankly said—

> "We cannot undertake to give further preferences in a manner which would operate to the disadvantage of our own industries."

But something more happened. It is a curious feature of this controversy that we in the House of Commons, the mother of the Parliaments of the Empire, must not express our free-trade opinions, and that only Ministers in the Colonies should give expression to their convictions. Mr. Fielding, ascertaining that English woollen goods were coming in under the tariffs and competing with Canadian goods, raised the general tariff from 30 to 45 per cent. and the preferential duties from 23½ to 33 per cent. Therefore my point is this: if you want to come to a good arrangement with the Colonies—and I think I may say, putting all Party feeling aside, that both sides of the House desire to do what is mutually advantageous—surely it is ridiculous to talk about going into a free and untrammelled Conference when Colonial Ministers who hold protectionist views are thus giving effect to them, while we who sit here are not allowed to give expression to our free-trade opinions. I agree with the Prime Minister that a Conference such as he suggested would be advisable; but if it is to bear any fruit it is essential that the representatives of this country and of the self-governing Colonies should clearly understand the nature of the difficulties which they have to overcome. It is ridiculous for this country to keep in the background its objections to taxation of food if the Colonies are allowed at the same time to increase their protective duties. If this Motion had been proposed two years and a half ago, I believe that it would have been assented to without a dissentient voice. What has happened in the meantime? The Government have taken a course which so far as I know is absolutely without parallel or precedent. We have looked forward to an enjoyable evening of encounter between ourselves and the tariff reformers. Why should the Government interfere? It would not hurt anybody; it would not hurt them; the House would have come to a decision; and if the Government want to know, pending the next election, what the opinions of the country are, what better opportunity could they have of learning what are the views about protective taxation than by allowing the representatives of the people to discuss the subject in the House freely and to vote as they like? But the Colonial Secretary says that he does not know what is meant by the protective taxation of food, and he puts a series of queries in order, I suppose, to get a little information. My right hon. friend knows what the protective taxation of food is as well as any Member in the House.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): My right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary referred to the shilling tax on corn proposed by the right hon. Member for West Bristol, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, and voted for by my noble friend and myself, and asked whether it was protective. Does the noble Lord consider that it was a protective tax or not?

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: My early official life was spent under Lord Beaconsfield, a strict disciplinarian, and there was nothing he more severely rebuked than interruption in debate. Lord Beaconsfield was in the habit of saying that, if the speaker who was interrupted kept his head, he would get the better of the interrupter. I was going to give my definition of protective taxation of food, which, I think, is that which is universally accepted. It is a tax imposed for purposes other than revenue. In my younger days we all had to know something about this question. I can assure my hon. friends who have come into Parliament in more recent days that if they raise this question, they will all have to be able to explain to their constituents what is the meaning of the taxation of food. I have given my definition, and I believe it to be accurate [" No, no."] Well, a new school has arisen among Members behind me, but I am afraid I am too old to take lessons from them. I intend to vote for this Motion. It contains doctrines that I have held all my life, and they were part and parcel of the Tory Party until a short time ago. [Cheers.] From those cheers I gather that I and my friends who act with me will be subjected to the imputation that we are voting against our Party. May I venture to give a little advice as an old Parliamentary hand to those of my friends who so cheer me ? We shall vote against the Government, we cannot help it; but it does not always follow, towards the close of its tenure of office, that the interests of a Government are necessarily the interests of a Party. When a Government vacates office it dies, but the Party behind it lives; and during the final stage of the existence of a Government the primary duty of the Leader is to think of those behind him as well as of those who sit on the Front Bench alongside of him. I have seen the Tory Party rise from comparative insignificance until it became a great dominant and Imperial power in this House, and if the Prime Minister consults those of my own political standing they will one and all remind him that just in proportion as the Tory Party freed itself from the principles of protective taxation so did it flourish and prosper, and just in proportion as it gets involved in the principles of protective taxation, so will its influence dwindle and vanish away, and in opposition it will never be able to give effect to the great principles of which it is the sole custodian. I do not want the Government to go out of office —I have nothing in common with the Party opposite, except, perhaps, in regard to the fiscal question—but worse evils may happen to a Party than that the Government should vacate office after being nine years in power. Let the Government on this question raise a fair and square issue and abide by it. They may be beaten, but they will carry into opposition the esteem of their friends and even of their opponents, and the Party behind them will carry with them that power of rehabilitation which alone can enable us successfully to maintain our principles hereafter. But to-night pressure has been put on my hon. friends, and a number of men, as everybody knows, will vote against the principles which they hold. Not only that, but the question upon which we have to vote to-night is, according to the statement of the Prime Minister, to be the great issue of the next election. Therefore, in voting reluctantly against the Government, I and my friends are sustained by the consciousness that we are acting in the true interests of a great political Party, to which, I can truly say, I have given, during the greater part of my life, an unswerving and unbroken allegiance.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I should have thought beforehand that there was no one better entitled to represent the great Conservative Party than my noble friend, who has been a devoted member of the Party and has served it in office probably longer than any other Member of the House, and whom I am perfectly willing to allow the right to speak for it. But I know not how it comes—old friendships weaken —how it can be possible for my noble friend, who has now attained, as he says, the rank of an "old Parliamentary hand," to think so badly of those with whom he has worked for so many years as to suggest that on this occasion, under the pressure of the Party Whip, a large proportion of them are going to vote against their convictions. No enemy could have said worse. I think my noble friend has been betrayed into a statement which he will ultimately regret. I listened, Sir, with great interest—if I may say so, with a personal interest—which may not be shared by all Members of the House—to the speech with which this debate commenced, by the hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Oldham, with whom and with whose family I have for so many years had intimate relations; and I congratulate the hon. Gentleman not only upon the ability of his speech, but also upon the fact that it was, as I think, in the best Parliamentary tradition, because, while expressing his own views and expressing them with vehemence and clearness, he was not betrayed into any of that personal bitterness which, I think, in our sober moments, we all desire to omit from our discussions. The hon. Member made to me a personal appeal. He said truly that he challenged my whole policy, and he asked me to use my influence—whatever that may be—with the Government to enable the discussion to be concluded by a division which was not to be taken on Party lines. That may be perfectly consistent on the part of the hon. Member, but it is ridiculous if he professes to represent the Party opposite. This question was brought before the country without reference to Party politics. I say here, what I have said again and again in public outside, that I desire that it should be treated as a non-Party question; and, as far as I am concerned, strongly as I feel the importance of the subject, I have endeavoured, and I believe I have succeeded, never to introduce anything in the nature of personal recrimination or attack. As far as possible I have avoided any purely personal argument or attack. [Laughter.] Hon. Gentlemen laugh at that. Do they deny it? [Cries of "Yes" and "Certainly."] That being the case, it is very difficult to accept the hon. Gentleman's invitation to strive to make this a perfectly non-Party and debating society discussion.

I have been challenged by my noble friend the Member for Greenwich on more than one occasion to bring forward my whole case and to ask the opinion of the House upon it; and I think my noble friend suggested that nothing but a lack of moral courage could have prevented me from doing so. I venture to suggest to the House and to my noble friend that there may be other reasons besides mere lack of pluck; and, among them, is the fact that all through my life, political and other, I have hated anything in the nature of useless debate. I do not fear, I am glad to share, any debate which can possibly have a practical result; but I have never seen the value of these pious opinions and abstract Resolutions which the House of Commons, from time to time, while I have been a Member of it, has been accustomed to pass without the slightest effect upon the practical politics of the day. If I brought forward my whole case on an occasion on which it would be properly discussed, what would be the result? What practical result would be secured either on my side or in favour of the views of my noble friend? Suppose I brought forward this Resolution and it were rejected. Does any one in his senses suppose that that would have the slightest effect upon the agitation which is going on in the country? Would it in any sense be conclusive? Sir, after all, this is a matter which ultimately will be decided by the country. We all acknowledge that. I ask my noble friend and others to believe that we who entertain the conviction that this policy is necessary will have at least as much persistence as Mr. Cobden, who was not in the least disconcerted by a single vote of the House of Commons, but who persisted with his arguments and agitation until he successfully carried his views into effect. In my opinion, honestly expressed, it is a waste of strength to be putting our views before the House of Commons as the subject of what I call a debating-society discussion, until we have some reason to believe that we have converted the country to them. Our first duty is to convert the country. In order to do my part in that process, and to ask the country to look at what is now a new proposal and consider it, I have accepted a position of less responsibility and greater freedom; and it would be contrary altogether to my policy and belief on this question if I were to think it right to waste—for so I would consider it—the time of the House of Commons in an abstract discussion which can have no result. I have been speaking upon the assumption that such a Motion as my noble friend asks for were defeated. But suppose it succeeded. That is conceivable. What advantage should I gain? My Leader and the Government have distinctly pledged themselves that under no circumstances will they raise this question during the present Parliament. What advantage is it to me to get a vote of the present Parliament under those circumstances? I do not think we need recriminate between us these imputations of cowardice or any other political sin; but we may accept as reasonable — even those who feel as I do on this subject—that discussion by this House is premature and not very practical. That is my view.

The hon. Member for Oldham, who takes a different view, does what I have neglected to do. He tells the House that he challenges the whole of my policy. Well, I cannot help thinking that he underestimates the force of his Resolution. It may challenge my policy, but it also challenges the policy of the Government. I will prove that in the course of my argument; but let me say that there is an important element in the decision of the House. It is not merely a condemnation of the proposal of one who is outside the Government, who is nothing but a private Member; it is also distinctly a condemnation of the avowed policy of His Majesty's Government. Some objection was taken to the expression of my right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies when he said that this was a tricky manœuvre; he agreed that he might have used another adjective, and I am going, with his permission, to suggest the adjective—it is a perfectly legitimate Party manœuvre, perfectly legitimate for an Opposition to put out the Government by any means in its power, and I give the hon. Member for Oldham every credit for having devised a very skilful means of securing that result. But if my noble friend who has just sat down has any idea that this is really a *bona fide* occasion for the discussion of the merits of preference and free trade, well, considering that he is an old Parliamentary hand, he is a more ingenuous person than I have ever yet met in this House. Sir, the Opposition do not want discussion; for them it is wholly unnecessary. Does my noble friend forget that in the early days of this session they proposed an Amendment to the Address in which they said that the subject had been fully discussed? [AN HON. MEMBER: Not in this House.] In the debate to-night discussion is nothing, the vote is everything. The hon. Member for Oldham spread his net very wide, and he has caught my noble friend. I really feel pained to think of the result, because my noble friend, in the speech which he has just delivered, declared that he did not want to put out the Government, but that is the sole object of this Resolution! The man who does what he does not want to do is an object of universal sympathy. My noble friend is committed; but surely, as to the other Gentlemen who belong to the Party which, I believe, rejoices in the extraordinary name of free-fooders, but who tax food with the greatest regularity, if I may judge from their speeches in the country, there is not one of them who is not devotedly loyal to the Government. They accept the Government policy; it is quite true that they are all opposed to my policy, but that, as I shall show——

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.): We do not all accept the Government policy.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, but there are very few of you who confess that in the country. We are all anxious to make a clean breast of it in the present debate, and I hope that those who do not accept the Government policy will make it perfectly clear to the constituencies to-night.

I want to call the attention of the House to the form of this Resolution. It is rather a curious thing, it has not been noticed up to the present time, that the Resolution was altered at the last moment from the terms in which it was announced by the hon. Member for Oldham in the first place. The alteration consists in the introduction of the word "protective" before the words "taxation of food"; formerly it was that this House was to pledge itself against any colonial preference "based upon the taxation of food"; now it is, "based upon the protective taxation of food." What is the meaning of that? Why was the word "protective" introduced? Clearly, of course, it was to increase the spread of the net. I wonder what fish it is on this side for whom that extension of the meshes was made? Why! I do not know whether the hon. Member for Oldham knew it at the time, but I assure him it might even admit me. I have said again and again in public that I am opposed to the protective taxation of food. It is quite true my opponents think I do not understand my own policy. But, at all events, that has been from first to last my own representation in regard to it. When I spoke in May in Birmingham, before there was any Party question of any kind, I declared to my constituents that I was not, and never had been, a protectionist. We have, of course, in all these discussions to interpret words; and, while on my interpretation I am not a protectionist, I have no doubt that on the interpretation of hon. Gentlemen opposite I do belong to that much abused class. But as my vote and my decision have to be governed by my interpretation of my own words, I do venture to point out that there is nothing in the Resolution as it now stands which would logically prevent me from voting in its favour. [Cheers and OPPOSITION cries of "Agreed, agreed."] Oh, I am so glad you agree with me; I always thought you would, but I had no idea that it would come so soon. After all, we shall all be ready to agree that we want to vote, not according to verbal subtleties, but according to the real meaning and intention. Very well! I accept the meaning and intention of the Motion to be not only a challenge to my policy, but a challenge to the Government policy. What is the Government policy? To me it ought to be plain even to the meanest intelligence, for what is it declared to be? The calling of a Conference between the representatives of this country and the representatives of the Colonies and great dependencies of the Empire, which is to discuss any question that may be raised in that Conference by any of the parties attending it, and among others—this, of course, being an important matter at the present time—the prospect of a commercial union based upon preference between those parts of the Empire and the mother country. That is the first thing. Is not that intelligible? Here is the second point, which is equally important. It is that the Conference shall be open, absolutely open, that it shall not be committed beforehand.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: May I interrupt the right hon. Gentleman? Does he mean that it is to be open in respect to raw material?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It is to be open as to everything; consequently there is nothing to prevent the Colonies, or ourselves, from raising, if they please, the question of raw material. There is nothing to prevent us from raising the question of absolute free trade within the Empire. There is nothing, according to the proposal made by the Government, which is excluded from the discussions of that Conference. But what is the meaning of the interruption? Does the hon. Member think that because it is open to the Colonies to raise this question, therefore it will be raised or seriously discussed. Does he think, on the other hand, that because it is open to us to raise the question of free trade within the Empire our representatives are likely to do so when they know that the circumstances of the Colonies prevent, and, in my opinion, rightly prevent, them at the present time from giving anything in the nature of absolute free trade? No, Sir! The Conference is to be free and open; but at the same time it is perfectly easy for any sensible man who has followed this controversy, and knows what the Colonies have said on the subject, to imagine beforehand, and probably correctly, what will be the serious subjects of discussion. Now, what would be the effect of the Resolution? The effect of the Resolution would be to muzzle the Conference in regard to the one subject——

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): Why should it muzzle the Conference?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: To muzzle the Conference in reference to the one thing upon which I am confident the greatest attention will be directed. You may say to the Colonies, "It is open to you to talk about anything; you can talk about a contribution to the Navy, you can talk about a contribution to the Army; if you like you can talk about any mortal thing concerning the different parts of the Empire;" but you know perfectly well that the thing that they will come to talk about is this question of colonial preference. My noble friend said; Why will it muzzle the Conference? Perhaps he will say what he thinks the intention of this Resolution is. The intention of the other side is to put out the Government, but is that his intention ?

Lord HUGH CECIL: No.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No; that is not his intention. He is a loyal supporter of the Government. Well, but in those circumstances the only practical effect will be that in view of a Resolution of the House of Commons, if the conference is held during the period of this House, the representatives of the country will go there practically with instructions given by this House that they are not to consider the question of preference or the only terms on which preference can be given. Then I should have thought that my noble friend, who has a very quick intelligence, would have understood that the result would be to muzzle the conference and to try to prevent our representatives even from considering what I have said the Colonies would consider the most important part of the duty of the conference.

Mr. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston): Prevent them wasting time.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Now, Sir, am I not right in saying in those circumstances that this Resolution is a challenge to the Government ? The Government want an open conference; those who support this Resolution are in favour of a limited conference. I confess that if I could have had my way, if I had the influence which the hon. Member attributes to me, I would have invited the Government to meet this Motion with a direct negative. That is my own opinion. I do not like a challenge to be thrown down and not taken up. I regret, though I entirely assented to it and am bound by it, the decision of the Government not to deal with this question at all in the present Parliament. I should have desired that it should be dealt with, as far as Parliament could deal with it, immediately. The Government, however, decided not to deal with it in this Parliament, and in those circumstances they are absolutely consistent in saying that this discussion is premature. I think they are more than consistent in inviting their followers, myself among the number, not to commit ourselves to a decision with regard to this conference until we know what it will bring forth. I must say I am very much surprised that we should have to-night my hon. friend—[An Hon. Member: Divide; and Ministerial cries of "Order" and "Go on."]—I was going to say I was amazed that my hon. friend the Member for Middlesex should use the language he did, because I think a fortnight ago, either in a letter or a speech, he declared that he welcomed the conference, because he was certain that that conference would show so great a difference between the sacrifices asked from us and the advantages to be given to us, that every one would see that my proposals are impossible. I assure him and the House if that is the result of the conference, if it is true, as my hon. friend believes, that we shall be asked for a very heavy sacrifice and, on the contrary, that no great advantage will be given to us, I should be the first to join with him and say I have been mistaken in my belief in the intention of the Colonies, and that as they have failed altogether to fulfil my anticipations, I would admit that any proposal of negotiation in this matter is unreasonable.

If I may, I want for a few minutes once more to call the attention of the House to the real merits of the proposal which is attributed to me. I beg the House to consider it not merely in a Party spirit. This Empire of ours, we admit, is held together by sentiment. Is every hon. and right hon. Gentleman satisfied about this ? Do they think that sentiment alone is sufficient foundation on which we ought to rest the interests of the Empire ? [Opposition cries of "Yes."] If they do and will study the question, they will find that they are at variance with our Colonies themselves, and that there is hardly a great statesman in any of our Colonies who has not practically confirmed the expressed opinion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that if in some way or another we do not draw closer we shall drift apart. That is a matter of immense importance. I say that the problem before us is, can we create a stronger organisation ? Can we do something that will be more than mere sentiment ? Can we add to the sentiment, the force and importance of which I do not deny, Imperial interests also ? I will ask the

House, to make my argument clear—I do ask hon. Gentlemen, Do you now want a consolidated Empire? Do you desire, as I do, that the Empire shall be drawn closer together if reasonable means can be found? You have given up the doctrines of Mr. Cobden. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] You no longer think as he expressed himself in a letter which I came across only to-day, and in which he said—

> "Colonies, Army, Navy, and Church are with the Corn Laws, merely accessories of our aristocratic connections, and John Bull has his work cut out for him for the next fifty years to purge his house of these impurities.'

I believe that doctrine has been entirely abandoned by the Liberal Party. I do not think it is now the desire of any member of the Liberal Party to treat the Colonies as "impurities." Very well, if I may assume that you are all agreed on the necessity and on the importance of consolidating the Empire, I say to you there is not one among you who can suggest any alternative to this step of commercial union, which is not the end, but only a step towards the end which I have proposed. No one has proposed an alternative. Alternatives have been considered and found by both sides impracticable. You have the advantage in this case of the support of the Colonies. There was an interruption that the Colonies made no offer. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said, "We offer to make a treaty with you." [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh!"] You may refuse to discuss the terms of a treaty, and if you do they will make a treaty with others and they will be perfectly justified in doing so [CRIES of "Oh!"]; and whereas now you have an opportunity of making a treaty which shall be to your material advantage, as well as to the increase of the strength of the Empire, you will, if you refuse it, go back to the policy of *laisser faire* which prevailed in the time of Cobden, and you will find that *laisser faire* will do nothing for the consolidation of the Empire or the security of its interests, but may very likely lead to a separation, which you will look back upon with regret.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Mr. Speaker, there is no very great length of time before us in which to finish the discussion, and I am aware that a right hon. Gentleman opposite has a desire to speak, as unquestionably he has a right to speak. I will therefore make such remarks as I must make as concise as possible; but I think the House will admit that I could not allow this debate to come to a conclusion without saying something in defence of the course for which the Government are responsible, and admit that they are responsible. The speeches of the mover and seconder were directed against my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham, who has just replied in a speech of singular lucidity and eloquence. But, as I conceive the situation, the true attack was not upon my right hon. friend, but is upon the Government, of which I am a member, and in particular against the policy I have advocated in more than one speech, and notably in a speech I made at Edinburgh. My noble friend the Member for Middlesex stated, in the earlier portion of his remarks, that he had read that speech, and that he found himself—I do not think he said in entire agreement—but, at all events, that he had a large measure of agreement with it. Now what did that speech essentially contain? It contained two statements; and the first was that I individually was unalterably attached to the principle of free trade, and that I did not, and never would, accept the responsibility for a protective policy. I may say that within that speech I defined, with unimpeachable lucidity, what I meant by protection, and my belief is that it is in accordance with the views of sound political economists for many generations past. I am not going to discuss the various definitions. My noble friend has given one of his own; but if he finds good authority for it in books of sound political economists I shall be rather surprised. At all events there was no ambiguity in mine; and it is because in the word as used by the hon. Gentleman who brought forward this Motion to-night there has been shown to be ambiguity, there is a reason why the Government propose the course they intend to take to-night, and in which they ask the House to follow them.

Well, that was one element in that speech I made at Edinburgh; and what was the second element? It was an appeal to the country in the face of the controversy raging on the fiscal question, an appeal to the country to discuss our colonial relations in a free Conference. I do not believe that my statement on that subject was a bit more ambiguous than my statement as to protection; it was clear, it was definite, it was complete; and it is because, in my judgment, the Resolution moved by the hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House, and seconded by an hon. Gentleman who is a Member of the Party on this side—it is because that Resolution flies in the face of that second part of my speech made at Edinburgh that, in my opinion, all who are good enough to accept the policy I have recommended to the country ought to support the Government in the lobby this evening. How my noble friend, who approves the speech made at Edinburgh, and who approves by implication of the proposition for a free Conference, can vote in support of a Resolution which flies in the face of a free Conference passes my comprehension altogether. My noble friend stated that all the Colonial Premiers have already laid down conditions which are inconsistent with a free Conference. I must not be taken as accepting my noble friend's statement of fact, but I will accept it provisionally for the purposes of this argument. It is precisely that example which I think ought not to be followed if we are to bring this great Imperial issue to a satisfactory conclusion; and the circumstance that these gentlemen have stated that they would never admit some cherished principle of their colony to come under discussion or be interfered with in a free Conference is surely a warning that we ought not to follow that example. We ought, on the other hand, carefully to abstain from doing anything of the kind, and, if we can, induce our Colonies to imitate the course which I hope we shall take ourselves by coming into the Conference unpledged and unfettered in order to bring its deliberations to a successful termination.

My noble friend is going to vote against us, because, as he says, he has always been against protective taxation of food; and for that reason, whenever he sees a Resolution against protective taxation of food he will throw every other consideration to the winds, and, though no human being suspects him of wanting protective taxation of food, he must give open profession of his faith in the division lobby. I dare say there are Gentlemen in the House who are in favour of protective taxation of food. Certainly I am not, and I do not believe my noble friend thinks I am. It seems to me sufficient to make that statement in the clearest and most explicit language, on the platform and in the House, without, by recording a vote which is perfectly unnecessary as a mere profession of faith, a violation of the very canons that, with my noble friend's consent and the general approval of the Party, I have ventured to lay down for the summoning of this Conference. Therefore I would respectfully say to my noble friend that, even if the Amendment which we are going to vote on to-night was an alternative to the Motion in the ordinary sense—if it was an Amendment to the Motion—I believe even then he might have supported the Government. As a matter of fact, my noble friend is perfectly aware that the essence of "The previous Question" is that it does not require those who vote for it to make any statement of policy, any statement of agreement—hon. Gentlemen would do so much better if they waited for the end of my sentence—this question does not require the House to express any agreement upon the substance of the Resolution. The essence of it is that the Resolution is one upon which at the moment, for reasons which may be good or which may be bad, it is not expedient for the House to express an opinion. Well, Sir, can you imagine a case in which "The previous Question," as it is called, can be put to a more legitimate purpose than we propose to put it to-night? I do not quarrel with the hon. Gentleman's proposition that we ought not to have a protective duty on food. Why should I quarrel with it? What I do quarrel with is the attempt to induce this House by a vote to do what it can to prevent the policy in which I firmly believe—the policy of a free Conference—coming to any useful or fruitful issue. And how can that be done so well as by the expedient we have adopted?

I am not going to enter into a controversy as to whether the motives of the hon. Gentleman who moved the Resolution are those of a declaration of his economic faith, or whether they are rather a Party device to embarrass the Government. I do not know that I take a deep interest in his economic faith, and I have no objection to his trying to defeat the Government. I think it is the proper corollary of the public step he has taken. Yes, Sir, but because the hon. Gentleman in the legitimate pursuit of his new vocation puts down a Resolution intended to embarass the Government, is that a reason why hon. Gentlemen on this side who agree with what I may briefly describe as the Edinburgh policy should choose, in order to help the hon. Gentleman to carry out his amiable and charitable intentions, to vote against a policy of which they have declared themselves supporters? The Resolution itself is ambiguous. If it were merely ambiguous I should not specially quarrel with it. But it is not only ambiguous, it is inexpedient. It is inexpedient because it is brought forward under circumstances which, if it were carried by the House, will not merely have the relatively insignificant result of turning out the present Government, but will have the result of producing a widespread misconception in this country, which is bad, and throughout our Colonial Empire, which is far, far worse. I therefore would venture to appeal to friends of mine who agree with the Edinburgh policy—I do not appeal to those who differ from it—not to do violence to their natural wish to support the Government by voting with the hon. Gentleman against their own view. It appears to me that no question of Parliamentary expediency can justify such a course as that. I am not asking them—I do not think this is the time or the place to ask them—for any profession of their economic faith. The previous Question does not touch that point at all. The man who votes for the previous Question votes that he thinks this Resolution is brought forward at an inexpedient time and in an inexpedient manner for the interests of the country and of the Empire. Those who hold that, as I hold it most clearly, should surely have no hesitation in giving a vote which, as I have ventured to explain it, at all events is capable of no misinterpretation, of no charge of ambiguity. All those who vote for it declare that there should be a Conference, and that if that Conference is to bring forth any result adequate to the effort which it will involve and to the great interests committed to it it should be free. That is the reason why my right hon. friend moved on behalf of the Government the previous Question. That is the reason why I shall support it; and that is the reason why I, with some confidence, appeal to my friends on this side of the House to follow the example which we are endeavouring to set them.

*MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I do not know whether my hon. friend the Member for Oldham, when he put down this Motion, was sanguine enough to suppose that the majority opposite, the tariff reformers below the gangway, and the Gentlemen of variegated opinions above the gangway—the Gentlemen who believed last year in the Sheffield programme and believe this year in the Edinburgh programme—would, if they could prevent it, allow the House of Commons to pronounce its judgment upon it. If he did, he fell into a strange delusion; because, as the Prime Minister has frankly told us, the Government, in moving the previous Question, are endeavouring to prevent, as far as they can, any departure from their policy of the open or, as it was called the other day, the empty mind. It would be strange indeed if the game of evasion and procrastination which has been played so long were now to be dropped at the eleventh hour, and, I venture to say, stranger still if the right hon. Gentleman, the Leader of this Assembly, permitted himself in this matter to lapse, even for a moment, into an attitude resembling respect for the opinion of the House of Commons—an opinion for which, as regards this fiscal controversy, he has now for two years exhibited an undisguised and unbroken contempt. We have heard a great deal to-night from the benches opposite of the advantages of a free and unfettered Colonial Conference. Might they not have set an example by allowing a free and unfettered House of Commons, for once, at any rate, in this Parliament, to pronounce its opinion upon that which is the dominant and capital issue in the politics of the day? The Prime Minister will add, if he carries this Motion, to what I think an unenviable record of successful attempts to lock the door of the principal forum of free discussion in this Empire. I say "free discussion," because a discussion which is not allowed to terminate, as it ought naturally to terminate, in the expression of "Aye" or "No" to the proposition put is not discussion in any real sense of the word. But though the Government, by their majority, may carry the previous Question, they cannot shift the issue; and that issue—the only issue before the House, the country, and the Empire—is the issue which is embodied in the Resolution of my hon. friend. The official policy of the Government has been throughout to endeavour to confuse and disguise that issue. Last year we had the Sheffield programme. In the debates that took place on this subject last session there is not a hint or suggestion from any representative of the Government that it was desirable to submit the matter to a Colonial Conference. Why, at the very end of last session the Prime Minister himself, after the deliberate consideration of a solemn appeal made to him by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, disclaimed any intention of taking any such step.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not admit that.

*MR. ASQUITH: It is recorded in *Hansard.* Yet, to-night, the Colonial Secretary is put up to represent as the sole ground, not of opposing this Motion, but of burking the discussion of it, that we are to have a free and unfettered debate in a Colonial Conference. There is a story of Mirabeau, who remarked of his younger brother that, "In any other family than ours he would be considered a scapegrace and a wit;" and after the speech of the Colonial Secretary, when he told us amongst other things that not to be able to make up your mind is a presumptive sign of genius, we may say that in any other Government but this the Colonial Secretary would be regarded as a master of the kind of sophistry which takes nobody in.

What are the facts? I am not surprised at the speech made by the Prime Minister. I do not claim any special gifts of prophecy, but apart from the right hon. Gentleman's elegance of style and the audacity of his dialectic I may say that forty-eight hours ago I could have made the speech which the Prime Minister has delivered to-night. But there is one person in this debate to whose speech I looked forward with much more curiosity and interest, and that was the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. What is the position of the right hon. Gentleman? He is going to vote for the previous Question. Just fancy, the missionary of a new creed, when the first article of his gospel is brought into challenge and made a matter of controversy, not upon one of those platforms where he is accustomed to stand surrounded by admirers and sympathisers, but here in the only place where he has to meet the representatives of the people face to face, the missionary of the new creed announces to the world which he has set himself to convert that he is going to vote for the previous Question. I fancy that this is a new and unique incident in the propagation of faith. I will not go back to Moses, or St. Paul, or St. Bernard, but I will take an illustration from a man of lesser stature suggested not for the first time in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman himself. Among his many curious and characteristic travesties of history he is in the habit of comparing himself to Mr. Cobden. I agree that generally he prefaces it with a patronising or compassionate reference to Mr. Cobden's sincerity of motive and shortness of vision; but the right hon. Gentleman, at any rate, finds one common feature in those two historical figures. They are both pioneers of a new era, preachers of a new crusade. Imagine Mr. Cobden after he had been through the length and breadth of the country declaring that the unity of the Empire and the well-being of our people depended upon the adoption of a particular policy, and when that policy was challenged before this House, cowering, as the right hon. Gentleman is doing to-night, behind the cover of the previous Question. Yes, this is the right hon. Gentleman who, as he has just reminded us, a fortnight ago voted against the submission of this issue to the people by a general election. He will not allow either the House of Commons or the nation to pronounce their judgment on the great controversy on which the unity of the Empire depends. He may run away to-night, but I venture to tell him, and many hon. Members opposite who are hiding their heads in the sand, that they will not be able to run away when the issue comes, as it soon must, before a tribunal where no one can move the previous Question. The right hon. Gentleman told us—and I think the Prime Minister rather assented to that view—that this Motion, which protests against any system of preference involving the taxation of food, is not a fair representation of his views. Are we to understand that the right hon. Gentleman is opposed to protective duties on food? I think sometimes he forgets essential parts of his own scheme. I should like to remind him of what he said at Glasgow, when he told us he was not going to tax maize and bacon. Why? Because they were articles of consumption of the poorest classes. If the foreigner pays the duty, what have the poorest classes got to do with it? And it is simply because the right hon. Gentleman knows very well—and by making that exception by implication admits it—that his scheme for the taxation of corn and flour and the rest is a protective scheme that he is compelled in order to make it more palatable to introduce what otherwise would be a totally illogical exception.

We are told that by voting for this Resolution we are voting against what the Prime Minister called a free and unfettered Conference. But the Prime Minister tells us he himself is opposed to the protective taxation of food. In other words, therefore, this Resolution is simply asking the House to put upon record, if as we all desire to do, we enter into friendly Conference with the Colonies, what they ought to know from the first, that in the opinion of the House of Commons, including the Prime Minister, the protective taxation of food cannot form the subject of bargain. And yet in the same breath the Prime Minister assures us that the passing of this Resolution will be damaging to the Empire, and might prejudice the ultimate results of the Conference, although, as I have shown, the very effect of the Resolution will be to clear out of the way the possibility of serious misconception. The Colonies are going into the Conference with a fixed and pronounced determination that under no circumstances are they going to lower their tariffs so as to bring British manufactured goods into effective competition with the products of their own native industry at home. Why should not we in the same spirit of candour tell them on the threshold of the conference that we are not going under any circumstances to make it a matter of bargain that food, the elementary subsistence of the people of this country, should become the subject of protective duties? That and that alone is the issue my hon. friend has raised, and I cannot understand even on the Prime Minister's own showing how there can be any justification on grounds of policy or Imperial interest in moving the previous Question. The truth, Sir, is, as the House knows very well, that this is the latest of a series of manœuvres unexampled in Parliamentary annals by which the present Government will, I believe, gain their best title to be remembered by posterity. The Prime Minister has found himself in the last two years confronted by the greatest and the most capital issue that has been raised in our time. No one at this moment knows where he stands. You may muzzle, as you propose to do to-night, and degrade the House of Commons, but you cannot befool and delude the people of the country. Every vote for the previous Question here to-night will be construed, and rightly construed, by the people as a vote, whether direct or indirect, whether by a straight or a devious route—a vote in favour of the protective taxation of food. That, Sir, is the question. Disguise it, distort it, delay it if you can, and as you may, it is in that sense, and that sense only, that the decision of this House will be interpreted.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 302; Noes, 260. (Division List No. 33.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Barry, Sir Francis T (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles Lt.-Col. H.F (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J.A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dewar, Sir T. R (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond

Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry South
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, Sir James (Staffords, NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon Arthur Fred.

Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks NR
Lee Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Henage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn Sir Frederick G
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Conventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Reid James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw Sir Charles Brine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry (Limehouse
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Maryebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)
Smith, Rt Hn J Parker (Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot. Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hon Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H (Yorks
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)

Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor. Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard. B
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hatch Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall
M‘Crae, George
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James W. (Wicklow)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor

Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Reid, Sir R Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters(NDorset
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudd'rsf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Churchill and Mr. Austin Taylor.

NEW BILL.

CRIMINAL NEW TRIALS.

Bill to make provision for a new trial in certain criminal cases, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bousfield, Mr. Fletcher Moulton, Mr. Wharton, Mr. Lloyd-George, and Sir Albert Rollit.

CRIMINAL NEW TRIALS BILL.

"To make provision for a new trial in certain criminal cases," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, March 22nd, and to be printed [Bill 89.]

ADJOURNMENT.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington) said, in moving the adjournment of the House, he desired to state that the Irish Land Commission Vote in the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates would be taken first at next day's Sitting, and afterwards the remaining Votes in Classes 3, 4, and 5, and the Report of the Vote taken to-day.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked when the second part of the Paper with reference to the Navy would be issued.

Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD asked the hon. Member to repeat the Question to-morrow.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he hoped the hon. and gallant Gentleman would remember that a Minister gave a pledge that certain matters in connection with the Vote which was closured that evening would be discussed.

Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD said he would consult the Minister on the subject.

Adjourned at twelve minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 9th March, 1905.

SAT FIRST.

The Earl of Northbrook sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill [H.L.]. The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. The order of Friday last referring the Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders to the Standing Orders Committee, discharged. Ordered, That the Bill be not further proceeded with.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that all reference to the payment of the costs of the Bill for 1903 be omitted from the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill ought to be dispensed with.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Heckmondwike Improvement Bill ought to be dispensed with, provided that Clauses 10 and 11, and so much of the preamble as relates thereto, be struck out of the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Wigan Corporation Bill ought to be dispensed with, provided that the powers to construct Tramway No. 2 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Aspull Urban District Council be proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Petition for the Darien Gold Mining Company Bill ought to be dispensed with, and leave given to introduce the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Hastings Tramways Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Clause 7 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Corporation of Bexhill is proved before the Committee on the Bill.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, provided that Tramways Nos. 1 and 2 are struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the Northamptonshire County Council and that of the Wellingborough Rural District Council are proved before the Committee.

Read, and agreed to.

Orphan Working School and Alexandra Orphanage Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield University Bill [H.L.]; London Squares and Enclosures (Preservation) Bill [H.L.]. Reports from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Metropolitan Railway Bill [H.L.]. Read 2a (according to order), and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Mexborough and Swinton Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]. The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on Friday and Tuesday last, discharged, and Bill committed.

Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydfil Scheme Confirmation) Bill [H.L.]. Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; Nine Mile Point Railway Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway

Bill [H.L.]; Rhymney Railway Bill [H.L.]; Leeds and Liverpool Canal Bill [H.L.]; Clyde Navigation Bill [H.L.]; Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill [H.L.]. The meeting of the Select Committee (which stands appointed for Tuesday next) put off to Tuesday the 21st instant.

Preston Corporation (Ribble Navigation) Bill [H.L.]; Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.]; Truro Water Bill [H.L.]; Torpoint Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Romilly be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Zouche of Haryngworth; read, and agreed to.

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company Bill [H.L.]; East London and Lower Thames Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.]; City of London Electric Lighting Company Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [H.L.]; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill [H.L.]; Central Electric Supply Bill [H.L.]; County of London Electric Supply Company Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.):—

E. Camperdown (chairman).
E. Lytton.
L. Zouche of Haryngworth.
L. Aberdare.
L. Estcourt.

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday next, at Two o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

GAMBLE'S DIVORCE BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to dissolve the marriage of Charles George Gamble (formerly of No. 14, Rostrevor Terrace, Orwell Road, Rathgar, but now of Mount Jerome House, both in the county of Dublin, and of 39, Fleet Street, in the city of Dublin), solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, with Ida Gertrude Gamble, his now wife, and to enable him to marry again, and for other purposes. Presented (on petition), and a copy of the proceedings in, and of the decree of divorce of the King's Bench, Matrimonial Division, of the High Court of Justice in Ireland delivered (on oath). Bill read 1^{a}.

GAMBLE'S DIVORCE BILL [H.L.].

Petition of Charles George Gamble, of Mount Jerome House, in the county of Dublin, solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, that substituted service of a copy of the Bill and of the Order for the Second Reading thereof, and of all other Orders connected therewith be made upon John Haynes, of 11, Vernon Street, Hammersmith, solicitor, and that in the event of the said Bill not being opposed he may be permitted to read, as he may be advised, the evidence given on the hearing of this petition, and as evidence on the Second Reading of the said Bill; read. Ordered, That the said petition be considered on Monday next.

MALONE'S DIVORCE.

Petition of John Richard Malone, of Baronston, in the county of Westmeath, Deputy-Lieutenant, late colonel in the Westmeath Militia, for leave to present a Bill to dissolve his marriage with the Honourable Charlotte Mildred Malone, otherwise D'Autichan, as from the 22nd November, 1892, and to confirm his marriage with Catherine Cecil Percy, his present wife, and for other purposes; was presented, and read. Ordered, That the said petition be taken into consideration on Tuesday the 28th instant, and that notice thereof be given to the said Charlotte Mildred Malone. Leave given to the Petitioner and to the said Charlotte Mildred Malone to be heard by Counsel at the Bar upon the said Petition. Copies of the proceedings in the High Court of Justice (Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division) in England delivered (on oath).

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 629. Cotton Mills of China.

No. 630. Technical Instruction in Germany (Supplementary and Miscellaneous).

GERMANY (NEW GERMAN TARIFF AS MODIFIED BY TREATIES).

Statement showing (1) the new German "General" Customs Tariff; (2) the modifications made in that Tariff by each of the new German Treaties with Russia, Switzerland, Italy, Roumania, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and Servia; (3) the new German "Conventional" Tariff resulting from all these modifications; with comparison with the existing German rates of duty on imports from the United Kingdom.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES (GREAT BRITAIN) (GRANT IN AID).

Treasury Minute of March 30th, 1904.

First Report of the University Colleges Committee, dated December 19th, 1904.

Treasury Minute of December 28th, 1904.

Second and Third Reports of the Committee, dated February 23rd, 1905.

Treasury Minute of March 8th, 1905, relating to the grant in aid of University Colleges, Great Britain.

VACCINATION (EXPENSES).

Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire into the subject of vaccination expenses. Part I. Report.

Minutes of evidence, with appendix and index to evidence. Part II.

LOAN FUND BOARD OF IRELAND.

Sixty-seventh Annual Report, 1904.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade.—

Amending the Blackpool and Garstang Light Railway Order, 1901.

Amending the Mid-Suffolk Light Railway Order, 1900.

Amending the North Lindsay Light Railways Order, 1900.

Authorising the construction of a light railway in the county of Derby, from the Midland Railway Company's (Dore and Chinley) Railway at or near Hope Station to Bradwell and Castleton.

Authorising the construction of light railways in the county of Middlesex between Hounslow and Cranford, and between Heston, Hounslow, Hanworth, Twickenham, and Sunbury Cross, being extensions of the existing and authorised undertaking of the London United Tramways (1901), Limited.

EMIGRATION.

Report on the Emigrants' Information Office, for the year ended December 31st, 1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COUNTY COURTS ACT, 1888.

Order of the Lord Chancellor, dated February 23rd, 1905, under Section 45 of the Act, ordering that Arthur Labron Lowe, Registrar of the county court of Warwickshire, held at Birmingham, shall not practice as a solicitor, and that Section 20 of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, shall not apply to the office of the said Arthur Labron Lowe.

BARBADOS.

Special Prison Rules for "Juvenile Adult" Prisoners.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SIR JOHN SOANE'S MUSEUM.

Statement of the Funds, January 5th, 1905. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to regulate whale fisheries in Scotland. Was presented by the Marquess of Linlithgow; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next. (No. 21.)

CONVOCATIONS OF THE CLERGY BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to declare the law in regard to the reform of the convocations of Canterbury and York, and to make provision for joint sittings of the said convocations. Was presented by the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 22.)

PUBLIC MEETINGS (FACILITIES) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill for granting the use of schoolrooms for public meetings. Was presented by the Lord Burghclere; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 23.)

A CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I rise to ask the noble Marquess the Leader of the House a Question of which I have given him private notice. Two days ago your Lordships may have noticed an announcement in the public Press with regard to a meeting of the Cabinet. Now the Question I wish to ask is one of considerable historical interest, and also, I should say, of considerable constitutional importance. In the list of those who attended the Cabinet I noticed the name of Lord Cawdor, who has lately been nominated to succeed the noble Earl Lord Selborne as First Lord of the Admiralty, though I believe the warrant has not yet been issued. I believe also that the noble Earl, Lord Cawdor, is not yet a member of His Majesty's Privy Council, and there can be no question that the Cabinet must consist entirely of members of the Privy Council. It is only on special occasions when non-members are present, as, for instance, when the Commander-in-Chief, or a general, or the Attorney-General is brought in to advise the Cabinet. Without saying anything more, and without pointing out what the consequences may be if I am correct, I would ask the noble Marquess the Question of which I have given him notice, namely, whether the statement in the Press that Lord Cawdor attended a Cabinet Council on March 7th is correct, and, if so, whether before his attendance he had been sworn of the Privy Council.

*__THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE)__: My Lords, it is the case that my noble friend Lord Cawdor, although he has not yet assumed the high office for which he has been designated, and although he has not yet been sworn of the Privy Council, was present at a Cabinet meeting held on Tuesday last. The noble Earl regards this occurrence as one creating an historical incident of great importance, and as involving constitutional issues of a first-rate character. Surely, the noble Earl's experience as a Cabinet Minister must have made him aware that it is far from unusual for gentlemen, not members of the Privy Council, to be present at Cabinet meetings when their presence is desired for any particular reason. The noble Earl seemed to think that these occasional visits only took place in the case of generals, and, I think, he added Attorney-Generals.

EARL SPENCER: And some others.

*__THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE__: But I can assure the noble Earl that, within my own comparatively short experience as a Cabinet Minister, that category has been very considerably enlarged. Even if it be assumed, as the noble Earl is, no doubt, correct in assuming, that the Cabinet is a committee of members of the Privy Council, I cannot bring myself to believe that the presence of the noble Lord to whom this Question has reference, even if it be an irregularity, is an irregularity which deserves the importance which the noble Earl opposite attaches to it. It seems to me obvious that there were reasons of convenience for which it was very desirable that my noble friend Lord Cawdor should have an opportunity of being present during the discussion of subjects with which he is likely to have many opportunities of dealing when he has become formally installed in his position as a Cabinet Minister.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, I do not wish to prolong this conversation, but I beg to point out that the statement that Lord Cawdor attended the Cabinet is not a mere statement in the newspapers, which might have been an error. His name was included in the official list of members of the Cabinet who attended on that occasion, which was issued to the Press. That, I think makes a very considerable difference. The names of those who attend the Cabinet not being members of the Cabinet are not sent to the newspapers by His Majesty's Government. The name of Lord Cawdor did appear in the official list, and my noble friend is quite right in drawing attention to what is an irregularity and inconsistent with the fundamental constitution of the Cabinet.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): The noble Marquess refers to what he calls an official list of members who attend Cabinet Councils. I am not aware that it is official. I can only say that if it is it is very often most inaccurate. I have repeatedly observed that people's names are inserted in it who were not at the Cabinet meeting at all, and that sometimes the names of people who were there are not mentioned. With regard to the practice, I may say that I attended a good many years ago the Cabinet Councils of Lord Beaconsfield when I was Solicitor-General.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, the Bill which I shall ask your Lordships to read a second time to-day is not one of great complexity, nor is it very long or very difficult to understand, and, I think, I can promise your Lordships that I will put the main considerations which have induced me to move in the matter within such a compass as will not unduly trespass upon your Lordships' time and attention. But if I make that preface, I should not like to minimise the importance of the subject with which this Bill deals, because, in my humble opinion, it is a matter of very considerable and growing importance, and one which, if it is to be dealt with at all, had better be dealt with before it can be alleged that large vested interests have been created.

I start from the proposition that it is not only important, but of great public interest, to maintain both for the country and for the town the beauty and the symmetry of our outdoor life. I think it is not less true of the town than of the country, but country communities are not so easily organised. They are not so alive to their corporate interests, and I think that some of the erections which we see throughout the country would not have been so long endured if there had been an effective means of checking them. I aim in this Bill not only at the abatement of what I suggest is in some parts of the country a serious nuisance, but at preserving both the grace and the dignity of many of the most beautiful parts of our scenery both in town and country. I suggest that the time has come when there ought to be some control of the method of advertising even as it now exists. I think it ought to be undertaken both for town and country. Many urban communities have started upon this enterprise themselves for the preservation of the amenity of their area; many more have tried to do it. As I know from my experience last year in undertaking the private Bill work of your Lordships' House, it is one of the most common features of Bills promoted by municipal corporations to endeavour to get some control over the vagaries of advertisers, both in the matter of large and unsightly hoardings and in the matter of skysigns and flashing signals at night. I venture to suggest that this is rather too important a matter to be left to the separate initiative of the many hundreds of local authorities.

My suggestion is, and I believe that to this extent, at any rate, I shall have behind me not only the Home Office and the Local Government Board, but also the Irish Office and the Scottish Office, that if this thing is to be done at all the right way to proceed is to lay down a general law, and to give the local authorities power to administer that law within their area, always subject to the control of the various Government Departments which have to sanction the by-laws, so that while there may be a sufficient play for local feeling and local desires there shall be general control exercised by an authority which is amenable to Parliament itself. I disclaim at once any idea of harassing interference with a legitimate business.

I recognise that advertising within limits is a necessity of the circumstances in which we live. I do not think it would be possible, even if I or those for whom I am acting were enthusiastic enough to desire it, to altogether put down that which, in my opinion, is very much overdone, and which does not produce such great advantages as many people seem to suppose.

I frankly admit that all advertisements are not bad, and that some are necessary; but what I do submit to your Lordships is that those which are objectionable should be controlled even in the interests of the other class that are not themselves objectionable. I think there is a widespread desire for some power of control over these advertisements. I do not think any of your Lordships can have been up the river Thames in the summer or along many of our great railways, or, indeed, have walked about almost any large city or have gone to some of the most important health resorts, without seeing large placards which are in themselves extremely unsightly, and which deprive many people of a great deal of the pleasure they would otherwise obtain by looking at the scenery round them. There was the case of the cliffs at Dover, which were extensively used for advertising some preparation more or less useless. Dover has been successful in obtaining a power of control and there the nuisance has been abated. I understand that in the neighbouring town of Folkestone, though in this matter I do not speak from actual personal knowledge, they have not been so successful in abating what is felt there to be a very serious disfigurement of the cliffs around the town. I note also that the City of Edinburgh has been successful in its efforts to preserve the amenity of the city, and I believe there is also a clause which gives the neighbouring city of Glasgow control over advertisers. But what I want to suggest to your Lordships is that the right way of effecting the object which, I believe, very many persons have in view, is for Parliament to lay down once for all general principles and to allow the localities to administer them.

Perhaps it would not be unduly wearying your Lordships if I tate the exact circumstances of what occurred in the City of Edinburgh. It is no doubt in some respects a special case, but it is only typical of many others. I venture to think there is no city in the country which is more vulnerable to attacks of this kind than the city of Edinburgh. The Corporation have obtained complete control over the sites where any advertisements may be put. They have had it for five years, and I have not heard that any real injury has been done to the business of the city in consequence. But let me tell your Lordships of the circumstances as they occurred. About six or seven years ago, possibly eight years ago, there was beyond all question a systematicand deliberate attempt to exploit the City of Edinburgh for advertising purposes. It was attempted to be done upon a large scale. It was chiefly to be done for the benefit of parties outside the city, and, therefore, on the part of people who had no interest whatever in the preservation of the amenity of Edinburgh, but interested only in turning it to account in so far as they could get a good advertisement for the wares which they wanted to dispose of. And apart from the fact that Edinburgh, having a large number of inhabitants, is therefore a useful place for advertising, it is a place visited by an immense number of travellers throughout great parts of the year, and it was, therefore, thought to be a particularly attractive place for this form of advertising.

The first attempt to get protection in Edinburgh was in 1896, just after the first attack which I have mentioned began to be developed, and a Bill was promoted in that year by the Corporation of Edinburgh. This proposed restriction was struck out by the Committee of the other House of Parliament, and one of the members of the Committee—he represented an English constituency, by the way—publicly gave the reason. He said he objected to any such restrictions on the general ground that in his district these advertisements were looked upon as an ornament and were the art galleries of his constituents, besides promoting business. Of course, there are towns and towns, but it was almost the unanimous opinion of the people of Edinburgh that this was a form of art gallery which they did not desire to have imposed upon them; nor did they think that the promotion of the business of outside persons was of sufficient importance that their city should be disfigured in its interests. The case for restriction was made even stronger by what happened in 1897, and I would venture to quote, in the words of the report of the town clerk of the City of Edinburgh to the town council, exactly what happened. In November, 1897, a company that deals in an article called Bovril acquired the option of a lease for some property which overlooked Princes Street and the Mound, and they proposed, having acquired that property, to place upon it a number of illuminated signs. A public outcry was not unnaturally raised, and remonstrances were addressed to the company by the Lord Provost and others. The company, I am bound to say, with a courtesy which deserves the thanks of the community, delayed the operations until they ascertained the feelings of the citizens in the matter. Within a day or two they acknowledged that they had received so many protests that they abandoned their proposal. In intimating their decision they said—

> "We are without any doubt convinced that the views of the people of Edinburgh are distinctly against the erection of illuminated signs as contemplated, and we accordingly give way before the evidence you put before us."

But they went on to say that they would be sorry if their sacrifice on this point led to their missing a chance which might be utilised by their competitors. They pointed out that two years previously they refrained from erecting a sign at the back of the High Street, but that some less scrupulous person had subsequently erected a sign in that locality. As I have said, since that time a power of control has been obtained over the sites where advertisements may be put, the amenity of Edinburgh has been saved, and I have not heard that any injustice or hardship has been inflicted upon any of those concerned.

My suggestion, therefore, is this, that there is a case for control on the general principle that the amenity of a district is the property of its inhabitants as a whole, and that it is not fair, certainly very much less than fair, that those who have no interest in a locality should have an unrestrained power to put up anything they like there, however offensive it may be. I am aware that some objection may be raised that these advertisements are paid for, and may be a valuable intérest to the owner or occupier of the property. I suggest that that is only one side of the question. They may also be a great detriment to the owner of adjoining property. At any rate, it is a fair question of discussion upon which side the balance of advantage or disadvantage lies, and I suggest that the proper persons to decide that question, subject to general law and general conditions, are the local authority of the district concerned. A friend of mine suggested that if these advertisements along railways are to be removed there might be a use found for them. I commend the suggestion to the noble Earl who leads the Opposition in this House, because I am sure he would be interested in it. They are not very sightly where they are. I do not know that they would be sightly anywhere; but if they were moved and made signs upon those fences on which there is barbed wire, during the winter they might give a valuable warning to that large class of persons interested in fox-hunting who I understand suffer in certain districts from the infliction of barbed wire. I throw that out as a suggestion, and perhaps it may get for me a certain amount of support for this Bill.

As I have said, the object in view is to give a power to the local authority to regulate these advertisements and to control them. I do not refer to the contents of the advertisements. The contents of advertisements in so far as they are indecent or otherwise objectionable are already controlled under the general law. I do not propose to give the local authority any additional power in those matters. In the second clause of the Bill you will see that there are five sub-sections. The first of those sub-sections gives power of control in cases of dazzling light and the use of pavements for pictorial advertisements, and the scattering of advertisement papers about the town or country; the second sub-section gives power to regulate the height of the hoarding; and the third deals more particularly with the places where advertisements may be placed. The fourth and fifth sub-sections give power to draw up by-laws for the enforcement of the provisions of the Bill and the removal of those advertisements which may be now existing after a certain period of grace has been given. The third clause of the Bill deals with the sanctioning authority, and the fourth and fifth clauses define what local authorities are meant in the different parts of the United Kingdom.

Your Lordships will not be surprised to hear that since I introduced this Bill I have been the recipient of a certain number of communications from those who are interested in maintaining the existing state of matters. Some of those communications are not particularly worthy of notice, but others of them undoubtedly proceed from substantial corporations who have a real interest in maintaining the right of advertising, and who, I am prepared to believe, in the main exercise their functions in a reasonable and proper spirit. I have been asked to meet them and to discuss the terms of the Bill with those who are interested in the matter. That, as a matter of course, I shall be glad to do, and have said so to them; but I venture to suggest that objections in regard to detail ought not at this moment to prevail against the Second Reading, because, as I suggest to your Lordships, this is a great and important public reform which has been already too long delayed. Although it may be a sanguine hope, I hope that those who do not want to abuse the right of advertising, but only to use it properly, will join in passing a reasonable Bill which, while strengthening their position, will help us to abate what is a very serious and growing evil. I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I agree with the noble Lord that it is desirable to give local authorities power to make by-laws respecting the exhibition of advertisements. I think everyone will be of opinion that it is undesirable that private individuals should exercise the power they at present do of going about the country sticking up advertisements wherever they choose without the consent of the owner or occupier, and simply for their own private purposes. To that extent, at all events, I imagine the noble Lord will receive unanimous support. But is he quite certain that the term advertisement, of which there is no definition in the Bill, covers all that he means to include? For instance, is he quite certain that it includes all kinds of hand-bills? I merely throw that out as a matter for the noble Lord to consider. I may say that in the Local Government Acts power was given to county councils to make by-laws with regard to nuisances. There then came the question, what was a nuisance? Several county councils, notably some in Scotland, did make by-laws for this purpose, and I understand that by a decision of the Court of Session it was held that the county councils had acted *ultra vires*, presumably, I imagine, because such advertisements were not held to fall within the term nuisance. At all events, I think some extension in the direction which the noble Lord has proposed is a matter very much to be desired.

I quite agree that county councils and local authorities ought to have power with regard to the area within their own jurisdiction. The noble Lord, in the instances he gave, dealt chiefly with the city of Edinburgh. In this matter large towns differ very considerably from country districts, and it may be expedient to give to corporations of towns powers of dealing with such a nuisance, for instance, as that which he referred to—the proposed advertisement facing Princes Street and the Mound in Edinburgh. It was right and proper that such a proceeding as that should be made impossible, but when you come to the country other considerations come into force. I quite agree that in the country, too, no one ought to have a right to put up advertisements without the consent, at all events, of the occupier, and possibly of the owner. But when you go further and say that the local authority may pass a by-law making it impossible to put up an advertisement in a place which is not in any way a public place or near a public place, as, for instance, in the case which was given of the London and North Western Railway, I think the matter deserves serious consideration.

It is not very interesting, when travelling on a railway, to pass a series of

"Carter's Little Liver Pills" and "Beecham's Pills," and other advertisements of that sort, which suggest in different degrees various imperfections of human nature; but at the same time there is another side to it. The persons who own these fields get a certain amount of money for these advertisements, and it is a matter for consideration how far it is just to say that a public authority may pass a by-law declaring that a private individual is not at liberty to set up in his field an advertisement which is not near a public place and which is presumably of value to him. Those are the only remarks I have to make with regard to the Bill. I have no desire at all to offer any opposition to the Second Reading, but I think these matters will have to be considered in Committee. I would once again repeat that I think there is a distinction to be drawn between corporations of towns and local authorities in the country, where the nuisance of advertisements is not, of course, so great.

LORD BELPER: My Lords, as representing the Home Office, the House will expect me to say a few words with regard to this Bill, because in England, at any rate, the Home Secretary has the power of assenting to these by-laws. I think the House will have listened with great interest and considerable sympathy to the case which my noble friend made out for the introduction of the Bill. Every one of us must have been struck by the hideous erections which are put up in town and country for the purpose of advertising goods, and I think there is a very general feeling that it is desirable that there should be some regulation and control over the constantly increasing advertisements of this kind. The noble Lord, undoubtedly, made out a strong case for the large boroughs, which have in many cases themselves taken powers to control the increase of advertising mediums within their areas. But I think if this Bill is to contain, as it does at present, powers to prevent the disfigurement of the natural beauty of a landscape, it is equally necessary that other local authorities besides the authorities over large boroughs should have this power. It is obvious that county councils would not be inclined to go to Parliament for the purpose of securing power to put a stop to advertisements disfiguring the natural beauty of the landscape at different places within their area unless it came to be a very grave scandal indeed.

The question to which the noble Earl has just referred, as to how far powers should be given under this Act with regard to districts where there is no population and no particular natural beauty which might be disfigured, is one for Committee; but I think it is obvious that a general Act is desirable, and I have to say on behalf of the Home Office that His Majesty's Government have no objection to the Second Reading of this Bill. But I must guard myself by saying that there are many matters, such, for instance, as those which were touched upon by the noble Earl who spoke last, which will require very careful consideration at the hands of the Government before the Bill is dealt with in Committee. With regard to the question raised by the noble Earl opposite as to what constitutes a nuisance, county councils have power already in the matter of certain nuisances which are specified, and many county councils have made by-laws which have been approved by the Home Secretary; but I doubt very much whether these advertisements would come under any by-laws which it would be possible to make without further legislation. If the Bill is read a second time to-night, I hope the noble Lord will allow a sufficient interval for the consideration of these various points before putting it down for the Committee stage.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I need hardly say that if the House is good enough to give the Bill a Second Reading I will allow full time for negotiations with those who think their interests are affected, and will not put down the Committee stage without communicating with the noble Lord who represents the Home Office and making sure that the date is convenient to him.

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee, according to order.

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1.

*THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY moved to omit the sub-section which proposed to reduce from six months to three months the notice required by the Act of 1897 to be given to the local authorities of the district in which the manœuvres were to take place. He said this was a somewhat innocent-looking Bill, but it contained several provisions which, if they were passed in their present form, would, in his opinion, act harshly. Among those provisions was the sub-section he now proposed to omit. The proposed reduction of the period of notice would prejudicially affect the interests of those situated within the areas scheduled for the manœuvres, and he believed the reduction to be absolutely unnecessary. He did not think any person who had any knowledge of the necessities of troops during the period of manœuvres would object in the main to the proposal in the Bill including woodlands and plantations for the purposes of manœuvres, but he thought that fair notice should be given. It might save owners and occupiers who wished to rear game on their land a great deal of money if the Act of 1897 was not amended in this respect, and they received the full six months notice. The manœuvres usually took place during September; many county councils, like the one of which he had the honour to be a member, met in May. If the period of notice was altered to three months they would not get the notice until after the May meeting, and it would be far too late in August when they met again for them to take the necessary steps for the general arrangements in connection with the manœuvres and to give full notice to the other authorities with whom they might have to communicate. He could not help thinking that it was very unwise on the part of the War Office at this juncture, when it could not by any stretch of imagination be said that that Department was a very popular one, to attempt in any way to unduly, and, as he believed, unnecessarily, hustle public bodies and private individuals, especially as the six-months notice had worked well.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): It has not.

*THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY said he had not heard any instance given in which the notice had not worked well. The present proposal would not tend to promote that good feeling between the civilian population and the War Office which was so desirable. The War Office in this Bill was expecting a certain amount of compulsory service from the civilian population. He hoped that that might be the thin end of the wedge to a further advance in this direction, but he was afraid that that was not likely to be the case. He did not see any real necessity for the proposed change with regard to the term of notice. The only reason for it that he could make out from the speech of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary was that six months beforehand was rather too long for the War Office to make up its mind.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: No.

*THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY said he did not think that any other reason had been given for altering the existing period than that six months was rather too long for the War Office.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 14, to leave out Sub-section (3)."—(*The Marquess of Granby.*)

THE MARQUESS OF WINCHESTER associated himself with the remarks which had fallen from the noble Marquess the mover of the Amendment. Whilst thoroughly inspired with the necessity of giving the War Office every facility for holding manœuvres, he was altogether opposed to the alteration of the period of notice to three months. The county councils were the authorities approached under this Bill, and they might find themselves unable to make the necessary arrangements owing to shortness of notice if the period of notice was reduced to three months. He appealed to the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War, in the event of his being unable to accept the Amendment, to at least insert four months instead of three, as that period would sufficiently expedite the notice as to enable the county councils to receive it at their May meetings. He was, of course, presuming that the manœuvres would be held in the month of September. He did not know whether or not it was the intention of the War Office to propose that they should be held at any other period of the year, but he did wish to impress upon those who were promoting this change that any other period of the year than that when the hay harvest and the corn harvest had been successfully secured was an impossible time for the manœuvres to take place. The holding of manœuvres at any other period than September was, in his humble opinion, impossible owing to the large amount of compensation which would have to be paid to agricultural tenants.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I would only say, with regard to the statement of the noble Lord who moved this Amendment that its adoption would save landowners money who were concerned in raising game, that the noble Marquess has perhaps forgotten that whatever damage we do we have to pay for, and we pay very liberally for it, as the damage is assessed by the Military Manœuvres Commission, which consists almost entirely of local landowners. I do not at all object to our paying full compensation. I think it right that we should do so; but as we have to pay full compensation it is quite impossible for any landowners to lose money through three months notice only being given.

*THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY said he was anxious that the taxpayers should not be called upon to pay unnecessary sums in compensation.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: That was hardly the ground on which the noble Marquess based his Amendment. The gravamen of the noble Marquess's attack on this sub-section lies in the fact that bad relations may be set up under it with the local authorities. He went so far as to say that we were hustling those authorities. My Lords, we are doing nothing of the kind. We are carrying out the recommendations of the representatives of the local authorities. This clause was based originally on a recommendation of the Military Manœuvres Commission of 1898. That Commission consisted of seven members, four of whom were directly appointed by the local authorities and the other three by the War Office. The three members appointed by the War Office included Lord Portman and Lord Pembroke, who were at the time members of the local county councils, so that the county councils had a total of six out of the seven representatives on the Commission which made this recommendation. Their recommendation was supported by the Commission of 1903, which also, of course, contained a majority representing the local authorities, and these local authorities, having experience in this matter, are not animated by the fears which the noble Lord himself has given expression to. The reason for the alteration is not a War Office reason, but practically a constitutional reason. The Army Estimates are very seldom finally framed till the end of February. They are not approved by Parliament until March, and constitutionally we are not permitted to say we will have manœuvres until, at any rate, one Vote has been approved in another place, and that never takes place until March. It may be said, "Oh, but you need not wait for that. You can send notice to the local authorities that you are going to hold manœuvres in their localities long before Parliament passes the Army Estimates." If that were done, I imagine Parliament would at once say that we had not got their permission to carry out the manœuvres. Therefore, we have to wait until the month of March, and are not able to carry out the manœuvres till six months after. We think six months unwarrantably long. You cannot give notice of your intention to put the Manœuvres Act into force until the middle of March, and the manœuvres, therefore, cannot be held until about the end of September, which is very often getting near the beginning of winter. It would be a great convenience to us and much better for the troops if we could always begin the manœuvres immediately after the harvest is over. I think that in asking your Lordships to give legislative authority to this recommendation, which has been made by representatives of county councils having experience in this matter, we are not asking too much. I therefore hope your Lordships will agree to leave this sub-section in the Bill.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH said the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary, had given the House another proof of the way in which the War Office looked upon the question of expense. The War Office preferred to pay large compensation for damage which need never take place rather than save the expense in the first instance. Listening to the noble Earl's speech, one would imagine that in the past, under a six months notice, it had been impossible to hold manœuvres. The noble Earl had raised all sorts of constitutional questions with regard to the notice. It would be perfectly open to the War Office to give this notice for manœuvres in the month of January, in spite of all that had been said in regard to the question of the Estimates, with a proviso that the manœuvres would only take place subject to the sanction of Parliament. Then the people in the county proclaimed would have timely notice that it was probable that manœuvres would take place over their land, and would be able in good time to make preparations. He would not go into the question of game at all. He put that entirely on one side. But their Lordships would agree with him that any owner of property, knowing that manœuvres were likely to take place over his land in August and September, would carry on his estate management in a different way during that year. He would not, for instance, set to work to do any spring planting that year, and if there was any great question of fence repairing he would leave it over until another year. Again, surely it was convenient for tenant farmers to know early in the year that manœuvres were going to take place, for it would, of course, govern such questions as cropping. The great reason put forward originally for reducing the notice from six to three months was that it was impossible to carry out manœuvres on land which had once been scheduled, even though the land had not been used, for another five years; but, under this Bill, if notice was given of manœuvres one year, and the manœuvres did not take place, the Government could proclaim the same land for the manœuvres the following year. This did away with one of the main reasons for shortening the period of notice from six to three months. He was sure that no noble Lord had any desire to place undue hindrance in the way of carrying out manœuvres in the fullest possible manner, but they must risk a certain amount of damage to land and inconvenience to owners and occupiers. It was, therefore, only fair that owners and occupiers should receive sufficient notice, and he contended that three months was not sufficient notice. All operations connected with land had to take place in the spring, and the persons concerned ought to be able to modify those operations by the knowledge of what was going to take place in the autumn. He would certainly vote with the noble Marquess in favour of the Amendment.

*LORD MONKSWELL pointed out that the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary, had not taken any notice of the suggestion he made on the occasion of the Second Reading of the Bill to the effect that the period of six months was inserted in the principal Act to secure that before the draft Order was advertised in the local Press, which had to be done three months before the manœuvres were to take place, it should be considered by the county council. He did not think it was respectful to the county council to put before it a draft Order already advertised in the local Press.

LORD STANMORE asked the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary, whether the constitutional objections to which he referred had in the past had this operation, that six months had always elapsed between the passing of the Estimates and the holding of the manœuvres.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I understand from my noble friend the Under-Secretary that the answer to that question is in the affirmative, and that six months has been allowed to elapse. What I cannot help thinking has been somewhat lost sight of by the last two speakers is the fact that this proposal for a change in the period of notice is founded upon the recommendation of a Commission, six out of the seven members of which were appointed on account of their position as large landowners, or on account of their connection with the local county councils, and that it was the experience of these six Commissioners that led them to the conclusion that the period of six months was unduly long. I confess that I listened with some surprise to the suggestion that in these matters there was any desire on the part of the War Office to hustle either the local authorities or the landowners. I believe, on the contrary, that the whole history of these Bills is one long history of earnest attempts to carry out manœuvres without giving either the local authorities or the owners or occupiers of land any just or reasonable cause to complain. I believe you may search in vain the practice of other countries in which an army is maintained, and in which that army undergoes training by means of military manœuvres for provisions so full of thought and consideration for the convenience of those concerned as the provisions upon which we have acted and now desire to act. We have been told that the proposal to shorten the period of notice is due to irresolution on the part of the War Office. It is nothing of the kind. The change is asked for because, as we all know, it is not possible to get the military Votes until well on in the spring. A period of six months brings you right into the middle of the manœuvring period. It surprises me to hear the noble Lord opposite tell the House that any Government could issue the necessary notices and set in motion all the complicated machinery which is necessary for this purpose in anticipation of a Vote of the House of Commons. It is contrary to all my own impressions. There is another reason which has not been mentioned. I believe it is the desire of the War Office not only that there should be these manœuvres on a large scale, but that opportunity should be taken for much smaller local manœuvres, and if in the case of each manœuvres, however modest in their dimensions, it was necessary to give six months notice, it is obvious that very great impediment would be placed in the way of the military authorities. This proposal has been made, not on account of any desire on the part of the War Office to spare itself trouble, but because those who have had practical experience of these manœuvres, those who have had to organise them in the War Office and those who have had experience locally of the manner in which they have been carried out, have come to the conclusion that unless the period of notice is materially shortened very great inconvenience and obstruction will be placed in the way of the military authorities.

EARL SPENCER said that whilst strongly in favour of facilities being given for manœuvres to take place in the best and most convenient manner, they ought also to consider the convenience of local authorities. He could not for a moment see why the noble Marquess should object to giving the longer notice. Surely a notice that the Government intended to hold manœuvres could be given at an early date, with the proviso that if Parliament did not agree to the manœuvres they would not, of course, take place. That seemed to him a perfectly fair and reasonable proposal. There was no need for elaborate preparations to be made until after the Vote had been passed by the House of Commons. He pleaded, on behalf of all connected with county councils, for the longer notice. There were many county councils whose meetings were held in May, who would therefore have hardly any time to make the necessary preparations and give the requisite notices for carrying out the manœuvres.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I would point out, in reply to the noble Earl who has just sat down, that we are giving the local authorities exactly the notice that the representatives of the local authorities who have had experience in these matters ask for.

*THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY said the statement which had been made by the noble Marquess the Foreign Minister, that there were to be more smaller manœuvres held, rendered the proposed alteration in the notice to be given to the local authorities more objectionable.

On Question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the clause, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 60; Not-Contents, 37.

CONTENTS,

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)
Brandon, D. (*D. Hamilton.*)
Marlborough, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Linlithgow, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cawdor, E.
Denbigh, E.
Feversham, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lytton, E.
Mansfield, E.
Onslow, E.
Stamford, E.
Stanhope, E.
Verulam, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Cross, V.
Esher, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Bristol, L. Bp.

Abinger, L.
Alington, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Ashcombe, L.
Balfour, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Biddulph, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Farquhar, L.
Forester, L.
Harris, L.
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Kenyon, L.
Kilmaine, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Lawrence, L.
Lindley, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Robertson, L.
Romilly, L.
Stuart of Castle Stuart, L. (*E. Moray.*)
Wenlock, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Grafton, D.
Northumberland, D.
Somerset, D.

Ripon, M.
Winchester, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Carnwath, E.
Dartrey, E.
Harewood, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Lichfield, E.
Northbrook, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.

Colville of Culross, V.
Hill, V.

Burghclere, L.
Coleridge, L.
Crofton, L.
Denman, L
Hylton, L.
James, L.
Manners of Haddon, L. (*M. Granby.*) [*Teller.*]
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway.*)
Monkswell, L.
Muncaster, L.
Northbourne, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Reay, L.
St. Levan, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stanmore, L.
Thring, L
Tweedmouth, L. [*Teller.*]
Wandsworth, L.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH moved an Amendment to the effect that the owners of enclosed woods and plantations—"on showing sufficient cause to the local Military Manœuvres Commission, may prohibit entry into any specific wood or plantation being their property." He said he was not in love with the absolute wording of his Amendment, but he thought that it clearly showed what his intention was. If the Bill was passed in its present form, woods and plantations would fall in the same category as land which was not woods and plantations. All that he was contending for in this Amendment was that woods and plantations should be put in a category by themselves. They should not be considered simply as part of the general ground over which manœuvres were to be held. The owners of woods and plantations should be put on rather a different footing, and there should be the assumption that any objection to entry upon woods and plantations should be specially given attention to by the Military Manœuvres Commission. He did not know that his words were the best possible words that could be selected, and he would be quite satisfied if the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary, would, on behalf of the Government, introduce other words with a similar object either at the next stage or on Report.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 21, after the word 'repealed' to insert the words 'provided always that the owners of such enclosed woods and plantations, on showing sufficient cause to the local Military Manœuvres Commission, may prohibit entry into any specific wood or plantation being their property.'"—(*Lord Tweedmouth.*)

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I quite understand that the noble Lord desires to place woods and plantations in a special category, but I am afraid from his wording that this special category would be one which would be very bad in working. The whole of the manœuvring ground is marked out with flags and so on by the Military Manœuvres Commission, and I think the Amendment, as drafted, would enable the owner to put up the prohibitory notices. This would obviously lead to confusion.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH said that was not his intention. He should only be able to put up the notices on cause shown before the Military Manœuvres Commission, and with their sanction.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I quite accept that correction, but I do not think it is necessary to put woods and plantations in a special category. The powers given to the Military Manœuvres Commission are very sweeping. I am advised that all woods and plantations would be covered by the word "lands," and it naturally follows, I think, that the Military Manœuvres Commission, the members of which are local people, will give special attention to woods and plantations. To put them in a different category would lead to inconvenience in working.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH explained that he did not wish to put them in a separate category from the point of view of the power of the Commission. All he wanted was to put in a proviso which should direct the Commission to give special consideration to them.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I think we understand the point of my noble friend's suggestion, and my noble friend the Under-Secretary will consider whether we can adopt his proposal that woods and plantations should be treated in a category by themselves. But what we are anxious to make clear is, that the last word shall be said, not by the owners of the woods and plantations, but by the Manœuvres Commission. If that is understood, we do not differ from the object aimed at by the Amendment.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH said he quite agreed with the noble Marquess. All he wished was a special direction with regard to woods and plantations.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH moved an Amendment to this clause—which deals with the power of an officer to control the public use of a road or footpath—providing that the commissioned officer in command, upon whom this administrative power devolved, should not be the officer in command of any "part" of the authorised forces, but an officer of *status* high enough to command a "company or squadron." This was, he said, only a small Amendment to secure that the officer who was to have the power of stopping footpaths or rights of way should be an officer of some *status*, and not merely a subaltern. He thought the Amendment would commend itself to the Government.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, line 25, to leave out the word 'part' and to insert the words 'company or squadron.'"—(*Lord Tweedmouth.*)

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: The Amendment does not commend itself to me, because it goes too far. We are not intending that even a captain of a company should have this power. What we had in our minds in putting in the words "or any part thereof" was the commander of a considerable unit—a division or a brigade. It really depends on the size of the manœuvres. If there are a number of divisions engaged, the commander of a division would be sufficient; if it is smaller, then the commander of a brigade. We have had considerable difficulty in drafting the clause. It is certainly not our intention that even a captain, except in very exceptional circumstances, should have this power, and therefore I hope the noble Lord will not press his Amendment.

Lord TWEEDMOUTH suggested the insertion of words securing that the power should not be exercised by any officer in command of any force less than a regiment. He certainly thought the term " or any part thereof " should be defined. Some minimum should be inserted, and the minimum should be not less than a regiment.

***The Earl of DONOUGHMORE**: Will not the noble Lord trust petty sessions?

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: No, I do not think the power should be so wide as that in the clause.

***The Earl of DONOUGHMORE**: There has always been, as I have said, considerable difficulty in drafting words which will meet the case, and I am assured by our legal advisers that " or any part thereof " is the most satisfactory phrase to use because it covers all cases. I do not think there will be any difficulty.

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: Why not say field officer?

***The Earl of DONOUGHMORE**: There may not always be a field officer present.

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: Then it is clear that the intention is that any officer shall be able to exercise this power.

On Question, whether the word proposed to be left out shall stand part of the clause, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 71; Not-Contents, 15.

CONTENTS,

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)
Northumberland, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Linlithgow, M.
Winchester, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnwath, E.
Cawdor, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Feversham, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Hardwicke, E.

Lichfield, E.
Mansfield, E.
Northbrook, E.
Onslow, E,
Stamford, E.
Stanhope, E.
Verulam, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Hill, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*

Bristol, L. Bp.

Abinger, L.
Alington, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Ashcombe, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Biddulph, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Crofton, L.

Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Farquhar, L.
Forester, L.
Harris, L.
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Hylton, L.
James, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmaine, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Lawrence, L.
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway.*)
Muncaster, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Robertson, L.
Romilly, L.
Saltoun, L.
Stuart of Castle Stewart, L. (*E. Moray.*)
Wenlock, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L,
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.

Burghclere, L.
Coleridge, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Manners of Haddon, L. (*M. Granby.*)
Monkswell, L.

Reay, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stanmore, L.
Tweedmouth, L. [*Teller.*]
Wandsworth, L.

The Earl of Donoughmore.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment, and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

SALE OF INTOXICANTS TO CHILDREN BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

BISHOPRIC OF BRISTOL BILL [H.L.].

[THIRD READING.]

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL: My Lords, this Bill has passed through its various stages in your Lordships' House without a word of question, and I now ask your Lordships to give it a Third Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Bishop of Bristol.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

THE SUPPLY OF TEACHERS.

VISCOUNT GALWAY: My Lords, I rise to ask the Lord President of the Council if he will consider the advisability of revising the regulations as to candidates for pupil-teachers, and the employment of probationers in schools, so as to secure a sufficient supply of teachers on a principle fairer to the rural district, and less costly to the ratepayers. This is a matter that presses very hardly indeed on rural districts, and I hope my request may meet with some sympathy from the noble Marquess the Lord President of the Council, especially as in this case I am not demanding additional money from the Treasury. Before the present Education Act came into force it was the custom in rural districts when a child reached the age of thirteen to put him to teach the younger children, and thereby an opportunity was afforded of seeing whether he had any natural talents for teaching, and, if he had, he in due time became a pupil-teacher and was recognised as a member of the teaching staff and paid. At one fell swoop, under the Act of 1902, the whole of this was put an end to, probationers being no longer allowed. In that way a very large source of supply for teachers was cut off, and I think this will be very seriously felt in a few years.

I also ask the noble Marquess to consider the advisability of revising the regulations on the ground of the hardship inflicted on the ratepayer. Now these probationers are cut off the position is this, that local authorities are obliged, out of the present limited supply, to secure teachers at a much higher cost. Under the old system a pupil-teacher would work, up to the age of nineteen, for about £52 a year, whereas under the present system he costs nearly £80, and the large sum which will have to be paid during the five or six years by the local authority for the more expensive teacher falls on the ratepayer. If this principle is persisted in it will make it impossible almost for the children of parents residing in rural districts to become teachers. In the towns it is quite easy for children to attend half-time and continuation classes from thirteen to sixteen, and in that way qualify for pupil-teachers; but it is impossible to expect that parents in rural districts can send their children to pupil-teacher centres away from home. I may be told that the travelling expenses will be paid, but they will be paid by the ratepayers.

We are told that it is very desirable that the population should not be induced to leave the country districts and concentrate in the towns, but what will be the effect if in a few years your teachers are all persons who have been recruited from the towns? How is it possible that children can be taught to take an interest in the country if you utterly close the teaching profession to people born and bred in the country? If you allow the employment of probationers in schools you will have teachers who will be able to instruct young children much more in the pleasures of country life than if they were all brought from the towns. It is in the interests of rural districts that some concession should be made in this matter. The present arrangement presses very hardly on the ratepayer and will press still harder in the future. On these grounds I hope the noble Marquess will see his way to allow the present rules to be revised.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, it will be in the recollection of your Lordships that we had a discussion last year upon this question, raised by the noble Lord the Chairman of the education committee of the East Riding, Lord Herries. While I cannot quite agree with the drift of the speech of the noble Lord who has brought the question before your Lordships to night, I feel that there is a great deal of substance in the complaint that it is most difficult at the present moment to adjust the new regulations of the Education Board with regard to pupil-teachers to the conditions of rural life, and I cannot say that I think the way the Board of Education are working these regulations tends to facilitate the transition. But I do not think that any remedy is to be found by falling back upon children of thirteen as part of the staff of a school, to be counted on that staff for the purpose of teaching other children.

I agree with the noble Lord that it is extremely important, if possible, that we should recruit the teachers who are to take charge of rural schools from the rural population. The conditions of service of teachers are likely to be more attractive in towns than in the country. The schools are larger, there are greater opportunities of promotion, there are higher ultimate salaries to be won, and therefore the most ambitious of the young people who enter the teaching profession have a tendency to gravitate to the towns. At the same time, we cannot too much insist that the most valuable qualities in a teacher are more needed in rural schools than in town schools. A rural school is about the most difficult school you can have to teach. It has a very small staff, and probably in the smaller schools they are lucky if they have one fully qualified teacher and one assistant teacher. The difficulties in such cases can be surmounted if you get exceptionally good teachers. I remember the evidence of Mr. Matthew Arnold when he was sent to examine the state of schools on the Continent. Describing a school—a small school—near Zurich, he said he found one master in charge of the whole school, but the great skill of that master enabled him to conduct the school in a brilliant manner. I am not going to say that if you can get good people you cannot grapple with the difficulties, but the difficulties are great, and you cannot expect the county councils to fix a scale of salaries for rural schools with an average attendance of sixty, seventy, and eighty which will compete with the salaries offered in town schools attended by 300 children. Therefore it is most important that you should try to recruit those who, having been brought up in the country, and having friends in the country, would be naturally wishful to go back to their homes.

I also agree that the difficulties of preparing pupil-teachers in the country are immense. You cannot work a centre there. Take the poor county of Anglesey, with which I am connected, which has a large number of rural schools. A young person from sixteen to eighteen cannot be going half a day to his school and half a day to a centre; he cannot even be going alternate weeks. I defy any person in charge of a school to make any one of these young persons count effectively on the staff when they cannot be trusted continuously with the charge of a class. In the old days they worried through into class management because they were given a class all the week, but to give a young person twenty-five children every morning or every afternoon, or every alternate week, would be disastrous to the class, and the pupil-teacher would not get a sense of responsibility.

The Board of Education have suggested that in the two years of pupil-teachership you may evade the obligations of their Minute by making the pupil-teacher a half-timer every alternate six months. That would be very inconvenient, but it would practically be making him a full-timer in the school for a year. I agree with the noble Lord that the system which has been introduced is extremely expensive. It is quite true that the Government have slightly increased the grants, but they have not increased them anything like so much as is set forth. They will now give in respect of a young person up to the age of sixteen, if he or she goes to a properly recognised secondary school, £4 a year for two years, and then for the two years from sixteen to eighteen they will give £7 a year, making a total of £22; but if the young person is sent to the secondary school earlier they will not give you anything except for the two years. The whole tendency of the pressure which has been brought to transfer pupils by scholarships from elementary to secondary schools is that the time for leaving the elementary and going to the secondary school should be between the ages of eleven and twelve—put it at twelve. The rules of the Board of Education for secondary schools make twelve the minimum age at which they begin to pay, and I quite agree that in the case of rural schools it is better that the child should move at the age of twelve. But you are demanding that the local authority shall take these children from the elementary schools and pass them on for four years to the secondary school. A child in a secondary school costs quite £12 a year to instruct, and you are going to give the local authorities, as an encouragement, £4 a year for two years. Not only that, but if the child lives at any distance the travelling expenses have to be paid besides, and some small bursary allowed. Therefore the whole of this is inordinately expensive.

I have a little grievance of my own to which I should like to call the attention of the noble Marquess the President of the Board of Education. The education committee of my own county prepared a scheme by which we were to have these scholarships and send our children to become pupil teachers, but when we proposed to utilise the intermediate schools of the county, which the House will recollect are schools under Government patronage and support, and supposed to be quite efficient, we received a letter from the Board of Education, stating that before they accepted our proposals as to scholarships they must know how far we were willing to subsidise the secondary schools so as to make them as fully efficient as the Board of Education might require. The Board of Education are heaping up weights upon us which are becoming too heavy to be borne.

Throughout England the county councils, as a rule, have thrown themselves into the administration of the Education Act with great earnestness and self-sacrifice. So far the ratepayers have not rebelled, although the education rate has gone up immensely. But if the Board of Education continue to increase the difficulties of the county councils, instead of trying to make things easy for them, there will be a mutiny of county councils. I am not referring to Welsh county councils, who have to be coerced by a special Act of Parliament, but to good Conservative county councils, and a mutiny of these authorities would be difficult, indeed, to suppress. The Board of Education have shown a tendency, ever since the Education Act of 1902 came into force, to pile up quite recklessly all kinds of demands in regard to those things, the cost of which falls on the ratepayers. I very much doubt whether Eton, Harrow, or any of our great public schools come up to the recent requirements of school planning of the Board of Education in regard to secondary schools. I do not wish to check the zeal of the noble Marquess for educational efficiency, but I would like him to go one step at a time. The method by which the grants are given, and many other matters which I will not refer to to-day, require serious consideration, and I hope shortly to have the opportunity of placing them more informally before the noble Marquess.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL: My Lords, I regret that no one is present on this bench who has at least some slight influence with the House. I represent portions of two agricultural counties, and this question looms very large in our mind. Yesterday I was discussing it with the chairman of the county council of one of those counties, and he told me that in his judgment the rate was rising to an absolutely impossible point. I asked him if he could put his finger on one particular item and he put his finger on this question of pupil-teachers. This question is a most important one, and I find myself entirely in accord with the noble Lord who introduced it.

*Lord HARRIS: My Lords, the noble Lord opposite, Lord Stanley of Alderley, has put the case so clearly that it seems almost superfluous to add anything to what he has said. But, just as he had a private grievance, so have I, and I propose to ventilate it. The noble Marquess will remember that when the Education Act was going through the House in 1902 I took the opportunity of cross-questioning him, and the noble Duke, who was then Lord President of the Council (the Duke of Devonshire), stated what the intentions of the Government were with regard to compelling county councils to put on a rate for secondary education. Both the noble Duke and the noble Marquess gave me most positive assurance that that certainly was not their intention. I must admit that so far they have held true to their word; but in another way the Board of Education are doing everything they can to tempt county councils to put on a rate for higher education. They are doing so in this way. There are certain grants for scholarships given by the Board of Education, and the liberality of this grant is limited by the stipulation that it shall only be given where a rate is imposed. In my county we were careful in the use of the whiskey money and laid by a nest egg. We have got that nest egg now for use for its original purpose—the relief of the rates; but unless we impose a rate now, although we do not want to, we lose the Government grant for the sescholarships; and at a meeting the other day we decided that on the whole it was more politic to secure the grant than avoid putting on the rate. I admit that the Board of Education cannot be said to be compelling us to put on a rate, but the difference between that temptation and compulsion is a little difficult to draw.

I endorse what has been said by the noble Viscount and by the noble Lord opposite, and would appeal to the noble Marquess the President of the Board of Education to impress upon the Treasury that this matter of the education of pupil-teachers is becoming a real and very serious grievance in the counties. I did not realise when this Act was passed the immense burden that was going to be laid upon the ratepayers for the purpose of training schoolmasters. That is what it has come to. The burdens are of all kinds. My noble friend the noble Viscount referred to the difficulties of rural districts in sending children to centres in the populous areas. We have had experience of that, and we have had to make arrangements, not merely for travelling expenses, but for boarding expenses as well, in order that these children may be kept in fairly good health while they are under tuition. All that expense has been thrown on the ratepayers for what, as I submitted in 1902, and submit again, is a national object. The most important duty that can be conceived is the training of the masters and mistresses who are to have the education of the children of this country under their charge, and surely it is not just that the great part of the cost should be laid upon a class of property which the Commission appointed by the present Government has declared to be already overburdened. I appeal to my noble friend to endeavour to induce the Cabinet to look into this question very carefully, for I honestly believe with the noble Lord opposite that unless some far greater assistance is given to the county councils than is given now a very justifiable grievance will exist and a very serious manifestation of the feeling that will be roused by that grievance may become evident.

*The LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL and PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (The Marquess of Londonderry): My Lords, I do not for one moment complain of the tone of the speeches which we have heard from noble Lords on this question, nor do I in the least object to its being raised. On the contrary, I approach the question sympathetically, because undoubtedly there is a feeling in the country, and especially in rural districts, that the rates at present are advancing by leaps and bounds on account of education, and this must necessarily bear very heavily on the land, which, as the noble Lord has said, is already very heavily burdened. How far the rates should be allowed to rise depends a great deal on the local authority. Undoubtedly, when powers were given by the Act of 1902 to the local authorities it was in the firm belief that they would watch over the interests of the ratepayers, and not add to their burdens. Undoubtedly the Duke of Devonshire and myself did say that the Bill of 1902 would not cause the rate to be raised; the only rate we caused to be raised was for elementary education, and the question of raising the rate for secondary education rests with the local education authorities. But my noble friend went further, and imagined that because we offered scholarships it would be necessary to raise the rate. It is impossible to please all parties, but I have no hesitation in saying that we are going to drop the system of scholarships in future.

*LORD HARRIS: Are there to be no grants at all for scholarships?

*THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: The scholarships are going to be dropped. Those who uphold the system of probationers have the right to a certain amount of our sympathy. Undoubtedly probationers in the past were an extremely useful class, and I agree that when that system was done away with to a certain extent there must be a grievance. But let us look at the other side of the question. My noble friend Lord Stanley of Alderley agrees that at the present day, when education has taken such a prominent place, we cannot go back to a system which existed many years ago and worked admirably.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: I said you could not go back, but I never said the system worked admirably.

*THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: It has been considered absolutely necessary to raise a higher class of pupil-teachers. The old practice of having the pupil-teachers taught in the school is not suitable to the present system, and the object of the Department has been to give a higher grant to pupil-teacher centres; and in Section 28 of the last Regulations for pupil-teachers an effort has been made to give advantages to the rural teachers, whose case is more difficult than that of the town teachers. The Department fully realises the difference between the two, and the undesirability of drawing the country children to the towns. As reading and education increases the attraction of the towns increases, but everything is being done to cope with the difficulty. Last year I was asked to give some grant for facilitating the transport of pupil-teachers to the centres. At the time I could give no definite assurance either that further aid would be available, or that if it were it would be applied in any particular way; but I have since inquired into the circumstances, and I found that they warranted me in approaching the Treasury.

To explain the further assistance that I am now in a position to announce I must go back to the first set of new regulations, which applied to the year 1903–4. We there provided that the grant for a pupil-teacher taught in a centre should be £3, that the grant for a pupil-teacher not taught in a centre should be £2, and that the grant for children who were preparing to become pupil-teachers and taught in proper preparatory classes should be also £2. These, as I say, were the grants for the year 1903–4. Now I come to the grants for the year 1904–5. Those grants were as follows:—£7 for a pupil-teacher taught in a centre, £4 for a child preparing to become a pupil-teacher and taught in a preparatory class, and £2 10s. for the pupil-teacher who is not taught in a centre. It was with reference to these grants and the question of providing more aid for the case of pupil-teachers not taught in a centre, that is to say, roughly, for country pupil-teachers, that my statement was made last July in reply to a Question by Lord Herries.

The result of the further information that we have been able to obtain, and of the representations that have been made to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, is that I am able to announce a considerable increase in the grants, which will be especially beneficial in the case of pupil-teachers who are not taught in the centres. The augmentations of grant that I have to announce relate to the current year for pupil-teacher instruction which ends on July 31st next, and also to part of the last year of pupil-teacher instruction which ended on July 31st last. For the seven months, January

1st to July 31st, 1904, we shall pay a further grant at the rate of £3 a year for a pupil-teacher taught in a centre, in addition to the grant of £3 already paid, and a further grant at the rate of £2 a year for the pupil-teacher not taught in a centre, in addition to the grant of £2 already paid. These additions, your Lordships will understand, benefit both urban and rural authorities, and with the further change I have still to announce, they will bring the grants for those months up to the level of the grants for the current year, with a small exception in the case of centres.

Now I come to the additional grants for the current year. There is no additional grant either for the child taught in a preparatory class or for the child taught in the pupil-teacher centre, but there is an additional grant for the pupil-teacher who is not taught in the centre, that is to say, generally, for the rural pupil teacher. The increase I am able to announce in this case brings up the grant for this year to the sum of £4 per head as compared with £2 10s. in the regulations, and will specially benefit the rural areas. The change in the grant which I have just announced is for the present provisional only and will apply to the current year ending July 31st, 1904, and possibly for another year. I can, however, assure the noble Lord that in any permanent scheme which may be framed for pupil-teachers special consideration will be given to the difficulties to be expected in rural areas, and though I cannot pledge myself at the present moment to any details, the assistance given towards the education of pupil-teachers in rural districts will not be less on the average than the amount which is available under the provisional arrangements I have just described.

It is most important that those who teach in our schools should know how to teach, and I have given special consideration to this question of the instruction of pupil-teachers. In view of the large sums which public education costs the country, it is most desirable that the instruction given at such great expense should be sound. I realise that there is a great deal more to be done, but the Department over which I have the honour to preside has at any rate done something to meet the necessities of the case.

*Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY: Will the Minute which the noble Marquess has just announced be included in the Code and laid on the Table?

*The Marquess of LONDONDERRY: A Minute will be presented.

NEW BILLS.

PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill for amending the law relating to the administration of oaths for the purpose of proceedings in prize courts; and

NAVAL PRIZE BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to consolidate with Amendments the enactments relating to naval prize of war. Were presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Monday next.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 9th March, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Rotherham, Maltby and Laughton Railway Bill (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

NORWICH UNION LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY [STAMP DUTIES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Society certain property, there be charged a Stamp Duty of five pounds, and such Duty shall be impressed upon the copy of the intended Act to be delivered to the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the section of this Act the marginal note whereof is 'Copy of Act to be registered.' "—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Clause 1.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked for some explanation of the Bill.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said all the matters contained in the Bill had been carefully considered by the Private Bill authorities in conjunction with the parties concerned, and there was no opposition.

MR. WHITLEY: But what is the effect of the Bill. It proposes something and we ought to have some explanation.

MR. CALDWELL said it dealt with the stamp duties. The matter had been carefully considered. The Bill was one for which the consent of the Crown was necessary, and it was forthcoming.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said the Bill, he understood, dealt with a revenue question and imposed an extra stamp duty. If that were so it could only, under the forms of the House, be proposed by a Minister of the Crown, and not by a private Member, even one so distinguished as the hon. Member for Mid.-Lanark.

MR. CALDWELL said it was on the last occasion proposed by a Privy Councillor on behalf of the Crown.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) thought the circumstances very peculiar and pressed for some explanation.

MR. WHITLEY agreed that a Minister of the Crown ought to be present to answer Questions, and he therefore moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Whitley,*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

MULLINGAR, KELLS, AND DROGHEDA RAILWAY BILL.

"To abandon the Drogheda section of the undertaking authorised by the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Acts, 1903 and 1904; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

COLNE CORPORATION BILL.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Colne Corporation Bill to omit Clause 30 of the Bill.—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

PETITIONS.

AGRICULTURAL RATES, CONGESTED DISTRICTS, AND BURGH LAND TAX RELIEF (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1896.

Two Petitions from Renfrewshire, for continuance; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSED PREMISES (HOURS OF CLOSING).

Petition from Bootle, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

TOWN HOLDINGS (TERMINABLE LEASES).

Petition from Blackrock, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Copy presented, of Army Estimates of Effective and Non-Effective Services for the year ending 31st March, 1906 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 73.]

ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES ESTIMATES, 1905–6).

Estimate presented, of the sum required for the year ending 31st March, 1906, to defray the Expense of the Ordnance Factories [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 78.]

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 629 and 630 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EMIGRATION (COLONIES).

Copy presented, of Report on the Emigrants' Information Office for the year ended 31st December, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUGAR (COST) (GREAT BRITAIN AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Return ordered, "showing the price per pound retail of the kind of sugar most largely consumed by the working classes, whether refined or unrefined, on or about the 1st day of March, 1905, in the capital cities of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Holland, Russia, Denmark, and Great Britain, respectively, together with the amount, in English currency, of the existing Customs and Excise duties respectively per pound in each case."—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Colonial Securities—Double Payment of Estate Duty.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to the fact that the executors of a deceased gentleman domiciled in New Zealand, after having paid estate duty at the rate of 10 per cent. in New Zealand in respect of certain New Zealand securities, have been compelled to pay estate duty again in England at the rate of 5 per cent. in respect of the same New Zealand securities, making a total estate duty of 15 per cent.; and whether, with a view to the reciprocal operation as between this country and the Colonies of Section 20 (Sub-sections 1 and 3) of the Finance Act, 1894, he will take such steps or make such representations as will prevent such double payment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) My attention has been called to a recent case of the nature referred to by the hon. Member, and I am in communication with the Government of New Zealand on the subject.

Publication of Report of Commission on Native Affairs in South Africa.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will present to Parliament the recently issued Report of the South African Commission on Native Affairs.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I propose to lay the Report in the form in which it has recently been published in South Africa.

Administrative Expenses and Income of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): To ask the hon. Member for West Salford, as Church Estates Commissioner, if he will state the total administrative expenses (including legal expenses and fees to architects and surveyors) of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England in each of the financial years from 1890 to 1904, both inclusive, and the income of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in each of the said years.

(*Answered by Sir Lees Knowles.*) The information desired is, in relation to each financial year of the Ecclesiastical

Commissioners, contained in their Annual Report laid before both Houses of Parliament. For the years mentioned in the Question, the income of the Commissioners' Common Fund, and the expenses paid thereout, were as follows:—

Year ending 31st Oct.	Official Establishment Expenses.			Legal Expenses.			Surveyors' Charges.			Architects' Charges.			Total.			Income of the Commissioners' Common Fund.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1890 -	32,766	5	7	14,332	17	9	7,485	6	2	1,449	9	11	56,033	19	5	1,151,047	3	10
1891 -	32,832	17	10	8,379	1	7	6,983	4	3	1,197	9	3	46,392	12	11	1,219,414	15	4
1892 -	32,289	7	3	12,135	19	9	6,448	7	10	1,177	8	5	52,051	3	3	1,209,137	12	1
1893 -	32,351	9	5	10,653	6	5	5,928	10	11	1,305	16	7	50,239	3	4	1,186,063	14	0
1894 -	32,290	15	11	7,887	11	1	5,766	11	7	1,546	6	11	47,491	5	6	1,232,528	17	9
1895 -	32,272	15	2	7,424	4	9	7,090	9	4	1,101	4	2	47,888	13	5	1,258,995	16	11
1896 -	32,572	8	10	9,853	2	2	7,170	14	9	1,245	3	11	50,841	9	8	1,266,735	14	7
1897 -	32,932	1	8	7,097	11	11	6,819	12	0	1,160	7	2	48,009	12	9	1,286,801	1	11
1898 -	33,476	19	7	6,543	12	5	6,794	14	10	1,240	12	3	48,055	19	1	1,314,256	5	5
1899 -	34,343	11	1	7,352	5	2	7,768	15	7	1,074	1	1	50,538	12	11	1,371,580	13	11
1900 -	34,764	2	8	6,576	7	1	7,164	12	11	1,280	10	11	49,785	13	7	1,400,592	0	8
1901 -	33,875	13	10	7,158	19	5	7,130	2	9	1,148	8	3	49,313	4	3	1,466,939	12	5
1902 -	34,801	4	8	10,136	10	0	8,208	19	3	1,506	19	9	54,653	13	8	1,509,920	9	8
1903 -	30,592	17	2	8,540	10	1	7,294	7	0	1,256	3	6	47,683	17	9	1,517,802	12	8
1904 -	30,939	16	6	7,498	17	5	8,464	0	10	1,528	3	6	48,430	18	3	1,531,177	4	3

Workmen's Compensation Scheme for Government Employees.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask Mr. Attorney-General, with reference to the statement made on behalf of the then Government, July 12th, 1897, that it was their intention to turn the compensation warrant as to Crown workmen into a scheme under the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Act, whether the scheme under the Act is still in force, and will be reconsidered in connection with any changes to be introduced by the Government Bill of the present session.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The scheme accepted by Government workmen under Section 3 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, is still in force. Before any new scheme is proposed for their acceptance full consideration will be given to any alterations that may in the meantime be made in the law.

Motor-Car Whistles.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to an advertisement of a patent whistle for motor-cars louder than a railway whistle, which can be heard half-a-mile ahead; and whether he can take any steps to prevent the use of an apparatus of that kind.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have not seen the advertisement referred to by my hon. friend, and I do not at present see my way to take any steps in the matter.

Report of Mansion House Unemployed Committee.

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): To ask the President of the Local Government

Board whether, in view of the legislation promised on the subject of the unemployed, he will advise the Central Mansion House Committee to prepare a Report, to be presented to Parliament, giving a detailed account of their proceedings, and of the results as yet obtained.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I contemplated that the Central Committee would make a Report, and I understand that preparatory steps for this purpose are being already taken. I fear, however, that some time must necessarily elapse before a detailed Report could be presented to Parliament.

Electrified District Railway—Protection of the Public.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether under the proposed electrical equipment on the District Railway there will only be one motor-man to each train; whether, having regard to the safety of the public, he will take steps to secure that there be two motor-men to each train.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am informed by the railway company that every electrical train, whether of seven, four, or three cars, on the District Railway will, in addition to the motor-men, have one or more men who will be thoroughly instructed in the control of the motors. It may be added that the effect of the withdrawal of the motor-man's hand from the lever would simply be to cut off the current and stop the train. As a further precaution, if a train passes a signal set at danger it will instantly be stopped through the automatic application of the brakes. I see no reason to take any action in the matter.

Division of the Kingston Estate.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can state what part, if any, of the Kingston Estate is excluded from the five sections into which the vendor has applied to the Estates Commissioners to have the estate divided; and if he will give the names of the townlands comprising each section respectively, and the number of tenants in each such proposed separate estate who have signed the purchase agreements lodged with the Estates Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Commissioners have declared all the lands comprised in certain specified townlands to be four separate estates. There are nearly 200 of these townlands, and I do not consider that any useful purpose would be served by enumerating them. The agreements to purchase have not yet been checked, and until this has been done the number of tenants included in each separate estate cannot be given. It is understood that the vendor proposes to include the remainder of the property in a fifth originating application.

Alleged Theft of £5 Note from Mr. Hannon.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that, on the 9th ultimo, the refusal of Sergeant Booth of the C Division to investigate the theft of £5 belonging to a man called Hannah, was reported to the Commissioner of the Dublin Metropolitan Police in writing; whether, seeing Hannah occupies apartments in Sergeant Booth's house and that other thefts of money belonging to Hannah were traced by the sergeant to his son, he will state why the Commissioner has not replied to Hannah's complaint and no action has been taken in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) Hannon, who was a lodger in the house of Sergeant Booth, received notice to quit on January 2nd. A few days subsequently he stated to the sergeant that a £5 note had been abstracted from a box belonging to his father, and demanded that the sergeant should investigate the alleged theft. The sergeant considered it would be indiscreet for him to take up the case, and requested Hannon to report the matter at the police station, with a view to its investigation independently by another officer. Hannon neglected to take this course, and took no further action until February 9th, when he made a written report to the Chief Commissioner. The police have not yet succeeded in tracing the missing note or in obtaining any information which would corroborate Hannon's account of the reported loss. Hannon is aware that inquiry is being made, and he will be informed of the result in usual course when the inquiry has been completed. The Chief Commissioner is not aware of any foundation for the insinuation in the Question that the sergeant's son, who is a boy under ten years of age, has been guilty of any theft of money.

Royal Irish Constabulary — Average Number of Men in Charge of County and District Inspectors.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can state what is the average number of men in the Royal Irish Constabulary in charge of a county and district inspector respectively; and will he say whether the two officers by which the force has been reduced since August, 1903, were county or district inspectors.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The average number of men in charge of a county inspector (including the force in Belfast) is 261. The average number of men in charge of a district inspector is forty-eight. The two officers by which the force has been reduced since August, 1903, were district inspectors.

Labourers' Cottages in the Athlone Union.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he is aware that Mr. Barnewell Crofton, Local Government Board Inspector, held an inquiry in the Board Room of the Athlone Union on July 9th last, and approved of the erection of eight labourers' cottages, and that on the next day he visited the sites and approved of them; and, if so, will he say what is the cause of the delay in erecting the cottages; and will the plots be given to the labourers this spring in order that they may be fenced in and potatoes planted.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Provisional Order, authorising the erection of six of the eight cottages proposed, became absolute on the 21st ultimo, and the rural district council are now in a position to apply for a loan to put the scheme in respect of these six cottages into effect. The remaining two cottages were petitioned against, and the council have abandoned their intention to provide them.

Promotion and Pensions of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he will give the number of national school teachers in Ireland promoted from third to second grade, second to second of first grade, and second of first to first section of the first grade respectively, for the triennial period ending March 31st, 1903; and of the number thus promoted how many up to the present time have been advanced to a higher class pension scale.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) For the triennial period ended March 31st, 1903, 580 teachers were promoted to the second grade, 113 to the second of first grade, and 55 to first of first grade. In 601 of these cases the question of pension advancement does not arise, inasmuch as the teachers interested were not promoted to a grade higher than their previous respective classes. In the remaining 147 cases the teachers were promoted to a grade higher than their previous classes.

Postal Facilities at Redford-Moy, County Tyrone.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received a memorial in favour of a pillar letter box being placed at Redford-Moy, county Tyrone; and if he can remove the grievance of a large district in regard to the posting of letters.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) An application has been received for the erection of a letter box at Redford near Moy, and inquiries are now being made on the subject.

Appointment of Chief Telegraph Superintendent at Bristol.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the post of chief telegraph superintendent has been vacant at Bristol since February, 1904;

and, if so, whether, in view of the recommendation of the Tweedmouth Committee that vacant superior appointments should be filled without delay, and the stoppage of promotion in the Telegraph Department, he will direct that the necessary appointment be made speedily.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The vacancy is not an ordinary one, but is caused by the creation of a new and important appointment. Matters relating to the telegraph department at Bristol have required special consideration, and I have not yet been in a position to select a thoroughly suitable officer to fill the vacancy, but I hope to be able to do so very shortly,

Posting of Late-Fee Letters.

Lord CECIL MANNERS (Leicestershire, Melton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that a new regulation will come into force on March 15th requiring letters bearing the late fee of an extra halfpenny stamp to be posted in a special box at a post office instead of as at present in any pillar box, he will, in the interest of the public convenience, consider the advisability of retaining the existing facilities of posting.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Owing to the enormous growth of the correspondence falling into the 7 p.m. collection in the central districts of London it is not now possible in the short time available to pick out all the letters, etc., bearing a late-fee stamp if they are posted in the same box as other letters. The result is that some of them fail to be selected in time for inclusion in the mails for which they are intended. To obviate this I have reluctantly been compelled to restrict the posting of these late-fee letters to special boxes which have been provided at all post offices in the districts affected.

Sunday Delivery of Letters between Belturbet and Milltown.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will give a Sunday post between Belturbet and Milltown, county Cavan, and, if necessary, even withdraw one of the ordinary week-day deliveries, seeing that Sunday is availed of almost exclusively for country correspondence, and that it is the day on which American letters, local newspapers, etc., are due to arrive.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I will make inquiry on the question of establishing a Sunday post between Belturbet and Milltown, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member in due course.

Education—Circular 512.

Mr. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to a leaflet issued by the Emergency League in which it is stated that Circular 512 sent out by the Board of Education is practically a dead letter, and the League is prepared to defend any case of prosecution under it; and whether he is ready, under these circumstances, to support authorities in enforcing the demands of the circular.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) My attention has been called to the leaflet in question. There is no ground for the statement there contained that Circular 512 is a dead letter. The Circular sets out the interpretation placed by the Board upon the Education Acts so far as they relate to school attendance, and conveys certain instructions to inspectors. The Board have not departed and will not depart from that interpretation or from those instructions.

Attendance at Schools by Children Residing out of the District.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the managers of a public elementary school have any right to refuse admission to a child on the ground that the parents do not reside within the area of the local authority in which the school is situate, assuming always that there is room in the school for such child.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The fact that a child does not reside in the area of the local education authority in which the school is situate is not of itself a ground upon which the managers of a public elementary school would be justified in refusing to admit the child. Where, however, children of one area attend a school maintained by the local education authority of another area in such numbers as to entail a serious charge upon the rates, the Board consider that the maintaining authority would be justified in directing the managers to exclude such children, unless the authority within whose area they reside agrees to contribute a proportionate sum to the maintenance of the school.

Gambling in Options.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the information received from Canada, Germany, and other countries respecting the working of legislation against gambling in options and futures is available for Members of the House; and, if not, whether it will be printed and circulated.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) If the hon. Member cares to call at the Board of Trade he can see the information that has been received on this subject.

Preferential Trade between the United States and British Colonies.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if, seeing that under the existing tariff law of the United States the President has authority to enter into treaties of reciprocity with Canada, Newfoundland, the British West Indies, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, or any British colony or foreign country, he can say whether under it treaties have been negotiated with Newfoundland, British Guiana, British Honduras, and Trinidad, securing the preferential Customs treatment of American products in those colonies.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) No treaty securing preferential treatment for American goods has been negotiated or is in process of negotiation on behalf of any British colony.

Petitions to Parliament of Indian Subjects.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India, having regard to the fact that petitions from natives of India for the redress of grievances have been again laid upon the Table of the House this session, will he take steps to make known to the people of India that no action in regard to such petitions is taken either by the House or by the Secretary of State for India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) As promised in the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member for Ipswich on July 19th† last, a copy of the Report of the Select Committee on Public Petitions was sent to the Government of India last autumn, and they were instructed to make the recommendations of the Committee widely known. I find that my despatch and its enclosures were published in the *Gazette of India* on September 15th last, and were also sent to local governments and administrations for publication in their *Gazettes*, and for distribution to commissioners and district officers, who have no doubt done their best to give publicity to the matter.

Election of Bombay University Provisional Syndicate.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that certain members of the Bombay University Senate objected to the legality of the rules framed by the Chancellor for the election of the provisional syndicate, and took no part in the election, and that their protest was supported by the opinion of counsel; and, if so, whether, in view of the Indian Universities (Validation) Act, he will direct the Chancellor to hold a fresh election for the provisional syndicate.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) As at present advised, I see no reason for taking the action suggested. If the hon. Member will refer to the speech delivered by the legal member of the Viceroy's Council on February 10th last, when the Indian Universities (Validation) Bill was under discussion, he will see that it was pointed out that under the law the Senate (not the Chancellor as stated in the Question) can only make one appointment of a provisional syndicate, and that a fresh provisional syndicate could only be appointed if it were beyond doubt that the present provisional syndicate was not validly appointed. This is by no means the case. The hon. Member will find the whole matter explained in the debates on the Bill referred to, printed in the *Gazette of India* for February 18th, which is in the Library of the House.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii., 415.

Indian Universities (Validation) Act.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that, under the rules framed by the Chancellor of the Bombay University, Mr. Justice Tyabji, Mr. Justice Chandravarkar, Mr. Justice Batty, Sir Pherozshah Mehta, the Hon. Mr. Setalwad, and other Fellows of the University have been excluded from the Faculty of Arts; and whether, seeing that these Fellows have for many years taken a leading part in the management of the University, he will withhold his sanction to the Indian Universities (Validation) Act of 1905 until this defect is remedied.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I understand that the gentlemen named in the Question, though not members of the Faculty of Arts, are, nevertheless, Fellows of the Bombay University and members of the Faculty of Law, and as such have the opportunity of taking part in the management of the University in the future as in the past. I see no reason, therefore, on this account to advise His Majesty to disallow the Act mentioned in the Question, which is already law.

Tibet Expedition—Rewards for Officers of Transport and Lines of Communication.

Sir SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that it was chiefly due to the exertions of the transport and special service officers on the lines of communication that the Tibet Mission Force was able to get to and was maintained at Lhasa, and that not one of them has obtained a reward; and, if so, whether he can explain the omission from the list of honours issued in connection with the Mission of the names of any such officers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The value of the services of those employed on the lines of communication in connection with the Tibet Mission both beyond and within the British frontier was fully acknowledged in General Macdonald's despatch, and in the Papers which have been presented to Parliament, and my hon. friend is mistaken in supposing that their names have been omitted from the list of honours. The officer commanding the line of communications received a C.B., two officers of the Supply and Transport Corps have received the D.S.O., and an officer of the Telegraph Department has been made a C.I.E. The names of many deserving officers were brought to notice, but it was impossible to give rewards in the cases of all who distinguished themselves, whether at the front or on the lines of communication.

Army Lists and Muster Rolls at the Record Office.

Colonel WELBY (Taunton): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, when a few years ago the old Army lists and muster rolls were transferred from the War Office to the Public Record Office, it was stipulated they should be available to all students under the rules in force there; if not, under what conditions they were handed over.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The reply is in the affirmative.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Mooring Places for Disused Vessels in the Clyde.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the Gairloch, Loch Long, and Loch Goil, the head of Loch Striven and that portion of Loch Fyne above Otter Spit as suitable ground for the disused vessels now anchored in the Kyles of Bute and the Holy Loch, to the serious inconvenience of the public; and whether he will arrange to have the matter reported upon by the proper Admiralty official, and the result communicated to the House.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): These lochs were all considered as possible mooring places for the vessels requiring to be laid up temporarily, but none of them possess the advantages of the East Kyle of Bute and Holy Loch.

MR. AINSWORTH: Will the hon. Gentleman lay the Report on the Table?

MR. PRETYMAN: There is no Report. The matter has been carefully considered and this is the result, but there is no formal Report.

Army Recruiting.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the estimated number of recruits required annually, under the present nine years system of enlistment, in order to maintain the establishment at full strength, and how many recruits have actually been obtained since January 1st of this year.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The number of infantry recruits enlisted for nine years required to maintain the establishment of the new Army organisation scheme when in working order is as shown in the document presented to Parliament in 1904 (Cd. 1910). At present a large number is required for reasons that I have already explained to the House. The number of infantry recruits actually obtained since January 1st to February 28th is 4,810.

Short Service.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether the scheme for the formation of the new localised short-service regiments is now definitely abandoned; and, if not, when it is proposed to take steps to bring the scheme into operation.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether the general-service Army, consisting of men enlisted for nine years with the colours and three with the reserve, explained by him in the House of Commons on July 14th, 1904, and in the Memoranda dated August 2nd, 1904, is now intended to be a temporary measure.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: As I have already explained, this scheme of short-service enlistment has not been abandoned, but only postponed until the nine years enlistments have proved sufficient to provide the men necessary to furnish the Indian drafts for the next two years and to stiffen the battalions. The scheme of enlistment for nine years forms part of the whole scheme of Army reorganisation together with the short-service scheme, but has been temporarily applied to all infantry enlistments until the infantry has been rehabilitated in the manner above mentioned.

Army Establishment.

MAJOR SEELY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the present establishment of the Army, and what was the number actually serving on March 1st of this year.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The latest numbers available are those for February 1st, and are as follows:—British establishment—establishment, 206,783; effectives, 206,170. Indian establishment—establishment, 74,648; effectives, 78,141.

Whitchurch Rifle Range.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what has been the cost of the range at Whitchurch, Gloucestershire; whether the range is now closed; and, if so, for what reason, and for how long it is likely to remain closed; and what arrangements are being made to permit the men of the depôt at Horfield, and the Militia and Volunteer Battalions to fire their annual course of musketry.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The range cost £5,000. It is now closed, owing to some cottages in the rear being unsafe, as there is not sufficient danger area. It is not possible, however, to state at present whether it will have to be abandoned. The 4th Militia Battalion of the Gloucester Regiment will fire the annual course on Salisbury Plain. Arrangements will be made for the other troops using this range to fire their annual course, but the places have not yet been definitely selected.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE asked if the cottages were there before the expenditure was incurred.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I must request notice of any further Question.

Indian Expenditure.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what are the chief causes of the Indian Government's increased expenditure during the first eight months of the financial year, under the head of Military Services, of 100 lakhs in excess of the Budget estimates; have there been any recent savings under that head, or has an estimate been made for an excess during the remaining portion of the year ending with next month; to what unforeseen circumstances is attributable the excess in these eight months under the head of Civil Debts; to what amount beyond the Budget estimate of £18,435,500 for Home Charges have the Secretary of State's drawings on India reached at the present date, and to what purposes are these excess drawings being applied; and what is the present amount of the Secretary of State's cash balances in this country and in India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): May I refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member for North Manchester on March 2nd.†

European Turkey.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that the latest information given to the House is dated August, 1904, the Government will lay upon the Table further correspondence relating to the European provinces of Turkey.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): It would not be desirable to present further correspondence on the subject until the important negotiations which are still pending have been brought to a definite issue.

Turkish Outrages—Rebuilding of the Villages.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any, and, if so, how many of the houses in the six villages in Malesia and the nineteen villages in Debritza, which were totally destroyed by Turkish troops, have been rebuilt, as promised by the Turkish Government.

EARL PERCY: We have received no information as to the rebuilding of these particular villages, but His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople will be instructed to make inquiries on the subject.

Post Office Savings Bank—Purchase of Consols.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the amount of Consols purchased by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt on account of the Post Office Savings Bank (exclusive of the amount purchased for depositors) in the years 1894 to 1899, inclusive; what was the average price paid for the stock so purchased; what was the deficiency in respect of the total amount of Consols bought in these years, taking the price at which the stock was valued on December 31st, 1903, namely, 87¾ per cent.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The details of the figures now asked for by the hon. Member will appear in the Return which has already been promised to him, and which is now in preparation.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will the Return be unopposed?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes Sir. I understood it had been given, and was being prepared. Perhaps the hon. Member will communicate with the Secretary to the Treasury.

---

† See p 172.

Interest to Post Office Savings Bank Depositors.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the fact that the average rate of interest allowed to depositors by the Post Office Savings Bank is higher than the average rate of interest on deposits paid by the London Joint Stock Banks; and in view of the fact that, in addition to the deficiency in the capital account of the Post Office Savings Bank, it is estimated that for at least several years to come there will be, as there has been in the last two years, a deficiency in the income account, he will take steps to secure that persons belonging to the well-to-do classes do not, as Post Office Savings Bank depositors, enjoy a rate of interest partially made up by contributions of the general body of taxpayers.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not admit that the average rates of interest allowed to depositors by the London Joint Stock Banks, which derive profit from the monies placed on deposit with them, should determine the rate to be given by the Post Office Savings Banks, which were established to encourage thrift and do not trade for profit. But, however that may be, the evidence given before the Select Committee of 1902 did not support the view that any considerable proportion of the depositors are outside the classes for which the Savings Banks are intended to provide. It has been suggested that the Savings Banks Act, 1893, passed at the instance of the Party opposite, by extending the limit of annual deposit from £30 to £50, has led to the introduction of depositors of a different class; but the evidence before the Committee was that the proportion of depositors of different classes had not been altered by that Act. I see no present necessity for taking any step to diminish the facilities afforded by the Savings Banks.

Electricity in Mines.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the new rules relating to the use of electricity in mines have been agreed upon; if so, can he state the date upon which they will come into force.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): In settling these rules, I consulted representatives both of the owners and of the men. The notices proposing the rules were sent out between February 20th and March 1st, and the rules come into force in each case at the end of twenty days from the receipt of the notice by the owner of the mine, unless he has previously objected to them in writing. So far, very few objections have been received.

Labour Statistics—Annual Abstract.

MR. FENWICK: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the reason for the delay of the publication of the Tenth Annual Abstract of Labour Statistics, and when it is likely to be ready for issue.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): This volume will be published very shortly; its preparation has been somewhat delayed by the pressure of work in connection with the preparation of special Returns.

Post Office Savings Bank—Limit of Deposits.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the rule as to limit of deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank is evaded by the opening by the same person of two or more accounts in his own name, or in fictitious names, or in the names of members of his family or other dependents.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Cases have come to light in which the limit of deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank has been exceeded by the opening of two or more accounts in the same name or in fictitious names by means of a false declaration; but such cases are very rare. There is no information available as to the extent to which the limit is evaded by the opening of accounts in the names of members of a depositor's family or household; as such evasions would not come to light so long as deposits and withdrawals were made by the persons in whose names the accounts were opened. There is, however, no reason to suppose that evasions of this nature are numerous.

Rural Postmen's Wages.

MR. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will take steps to give the rural postmen who start from the Oswestry Post Office the same rate of wage as those who deliver letters in the town.

LORD STANLEY: I have already announced to the staff that rural postmen starting from towns will be given the same pay as the postmen in the towns, and the rural postmen at Oswestry will be dealt with on these lines.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Does that apply to Ireland?

LORD STANLEY: Yes it applies everywhere throughout the United Kingdom.

West Highland Mail Services.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if, in renewing the mail contracts for steamer services for the Barra, Uist, and Benbecula districts of the West Highlands, he will endeavour to arrange a more convenient service, having Oban and Mallaig as termini; and if he will make it part of the contract that the mail steamer should call at Petersport Pier in Benbecula.

LORD STANLEY: There is at present no question of renewing the contract for the mail steamer service to the districts to which the hon. Member refers; but I may state that with the existing train service it would not be practicable to afford so good a mail service by way of Mallaig as is at present provided via Oban. There are also other objections to the adoption of the Mallaig route, as was pointed out in the letter sent to the hon. Member on August 17th, 1901. As regards the suggestion that the mail steamer should call at Petersport Pier, I find that such a call would delay the boat, and would prejudicially affect the mail service to and from the most important places in the districts concerned. In these circumstances I regret I cannot comply with the hon. Member's wishes in the matter.

Berwick-upon-Tweed—Preservation of Ancient Walls.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether the negotiations for the preservation of the ancient walls of Berwick-upon-Tweed, dating from the reign of King Edward the First, have now been completed by His Majesty's Office of Works; and, if so, whether they have resulted in a scheme which will prevent the threatened destruction of these interesting monuments.

*LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The negotiations have now so far advanced as to give reason to hope that they may be brought to a successful issue. The scheme proposed includes a lease of the historic ground and monuments to the Commissioners of His Majesty's Works which, if concluded, will effectually preserve them from destruction.

Land Purchase in Ireland—Archdale, County Longford, Estate.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether any application has been made to the Estates Commissioners for the purchase by them of the Archdale (county Longford) Estate; and, if so, to state the terms of such offer.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): No such application has yet been made.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: And supposing one is made——

MR. ATKINSON: I cannot answer a hypothetical Question.

Longford Land Appeals.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland when the next sitting of the Chief Land Commission for the hearing of appeals will take place in and for county Longford; how many such appeals are now pending;

when the last sitting of the Commission took place in Longford; and on how many occasions since have Longford appeals been sent to other venues because of the refusal of the Commissioners to come to Longford.

Mr. ATKINSON: A sitting for the hearing of appeals has been provisionally fixed for May 30th. There are 204 appeals pending. The last sitting of the Commissioners to hear appeals was held in July, 1903. Appeals from Longford have not since been heard elsewhere.

Monaghan Lunatic Asylum—Case of Nurse Holland.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can now state the result of the Government inquiry into the case of Nurse Holland, who was reported by the Inspectors of Lunacy as entirely unfitted for her position, having regard to her faithlessness in the discharge of her duties and the untrustworthiness of her statements.

Mr. ATKINSON: I have carefully considered this case. The appointment and dismissal of asylum nurses is vested solely in the committee of management of the asylum. The only way in which the Government could intervene would be by withdrawing the capitation grant paid to the Monaghan Asylum under Section 58, Sub-section 2 (c) of the Local Government (Ireland) Act of 1898, on the ground that the asylum is improperly managed. In the present instance the charge preferred by Nurse Holland was found to be false. The action of the committee in deciding to retain her services under the circumstances is much to be regretted, but I do not consider that their action can be held to bring the case within the provisions of the Act to which I have referred.

Mr. Robert Jevers' Estate, County Limerick.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, is he aware that the estate of Mr. Robert Jevers, of county Limerick, is up for sale in the court of Mr. Justice Ross; does he know whether any bid has been made for it as yet; and, if so, by whom, and what is the amount of it; can he say whether the notice of sale has been brought before the Estates Commissioners with a view to their purchasing it in the public interest for the benefit of the evicted tenants, small farmers, and labourers of the district; is he aware that a brother of the owner, by name William Jevers, is an evicted tenant, having been evicted off the Langford property convenient; and, if so, will he recommend to the Estates Commissioners that William Jevers will have the first claim for a farm on the estate of his father and brother of equal area to that from which he was evicted.

Mr. ATKINSON: The estate was offered for sale in the Land Judge's Court on the 1st instant. An offer of £3,250 was made and was considered insufficient. A motion on behalf of the owner was thereupon made to the Court that an application be made to the Estates Commissioners to issue a request under the 7th Section of the Act of 1903, and the solicitor having carriage of the sale was authorised to make such application. I am inquiring whether the matter has been brought before the Commissioners.

Irish Agricultural Department—Catholic Clerks in the Veterinary Department.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that the chief clerk of the Agricultural Department recently suggested to one of the Catholic clerks of the veterinary branch that he should withdraw from the representations which they had put before the Department in May last; and, if so, whether he will say what steps he proposes taking to put a stop to such action.

Mr. ATKINSON: This is a repetition of a Question put to me by the hon. Member on the 1st instant.† I have nothing to add to the reply given by me on that occasion.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of James Jordan, of Granard.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of James Jordan, of Derrycassan, Granard, who was evicted by Colonel Dopping in 1886, although offering to pay the full amount of rent which he was decreed for; whether he is aware that subsequently Jordan obtained a decree for £47 10s. for illegal eviction against the agent; and whether, having regard to the fact that this man's holding now forms part of the demesne of Derrycassan, and is therefore in occupation of the landlord, he will take steps to bring his case under the notice of the Estates Commissioners with a view to his reinstatement when the property is being sold.

---

† See page 27.

MR. ATKINSON: I am informed that Catherine Jordan deceased, and her son James Jordan, were evicted in January, 1887. Payment of the amount of the decree was offered, but not within the period allowed by the County Court Judge. No decree for illegal eviction against the agent was obtained. The evicted holding appears to be in the possession of a new tenant. The application of James Jordan for reinstatement will be considered by the Commissioners should the estate come before them.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in this case the evicted tenant actually paid the money to the sheriff? Whether it was paid to the agent I know not.

MR. ATKINSON: I am not aware that it is so.

Dopping Hepenstall Estate, North Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether any reply has yet been received from the Estates Commissioners on the subject of the proposed purchase of the Dopping Hepenstall Estate, in North Longford, under the 7th Section of the Land Act of 1903.

MR. ATKINSON: No proceedings are at present before the Commissioners in respect to this estate, and it does not appear, so I am informed, that the sale of this estate is pending in the Land Judge's Court. If particulars of the property are supplied to the Commissioners they will consider the question of issuing a request under the enactment referred to.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in this case a petition was signed by the leading men of the district, and the priests and clergy of all denominations, asking the Commissioners to take action? Will he draw their attention to it?

MR. ATKINSON: I am sure if the petition has been received it will receive the attention of the Commissioners.

Kenmare Guardians—Charges against the Rev. Mr. Duggan.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that a memorial, signed by seventeen members of the board of guardians and rural district council of Kenmare, was sent to the Local Government Board on January 30th, assigning reasons why a public inquiry should be held relative to the case of a fever patient named Cottar who died recently in the union; can he state on what grounds the inquiry has been refused; and whether, in view of the charges made against the Rev. Mr. Duggan, Protestant rector of Kilgarvan parish, steps will be taken to hold an inquiry immediately.

MR. ATKINSON: Such a memorial has been received. The grounds upon which the memorialists urged the Local Government Board to hold an inquiry on oath were that the Rev. Mr. Duggan had gratuitously afforded medical advice to a poor person named Cottar. As this clergyman is not in any way under the jurisdiction of the Local Government Board, they were advised that the matter was not one in which they could intervene. Moreover, there was nothing to show that the rev. gentleman had done anything illegal or actionable, rendering him liable to a penalty under 21 and 22 Vic., Cap. 90, Sec. 40.

MR. BOLAND: But seeing that this man died from fever and not pneumonia and the rev. gentleman has asked for an inquiry, cannot one be held?

Mr. ATKINSON: The Local Government Board have no power to hold an inquiry.

Longworth Estate, County Galway.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the acreage of the Longworth Estate, in county Galway, purchased by the Congested Districts Board; how much of it is untenanted; how long this portion is in the possession of the Board; what use is being made of it; when it is intended to divide it up amongst small adjoining occupiers; and what is the cause of the delay in carrying out the work of dividing this land.

Mr. ATKINSON: The estate contains 1,316 acres, all untenanted. It has not yet been vested in the Board, but it is expected this will be done in a few weeks. The lands are being let for grazing until the Board are in a position otherwise to deal with them.

Mr. ROCHE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the large quantity of untenanted land in this neighbourhood is giving rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction? Will he draw the attention of the Congested Districts Board to the fact?

Mr. ATKINSON: The Board have stated that they are dealing with the question.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): To whom are the lands being let? Is it to the adjoining tenants?

Mr. ATKINSON: I cannot say.

Pirrie-Iveagh Motor Scheme.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can state how many and what county councils have declined to accept the financial responsibity of keeping the roads in the condition required by the promoters of the Pirrie-Iveagh scheme; and whether any negotiations took place between the promoters and any member of the Government with reference to providing funds from the Treasury for putting the roads in order.

Mr. ATKINSON: The local authorities in the counties of Mayo, Galway, Londonderry, and Antrim declined to incur the expenditure necessary for putting the roads into proper condition for motor traffic. In reply to the second part of the Question the hon. Member is doubtless aware that, acting on a suggestion made by the Galway County Council, the Government proposed an Amendment to the Labourers Bill of last session which contemplated the expenditure of the whole or part of the unexpended balance of a county's share in the Exchequer contribution for labourers' cottages for purposes such as the schemes referred to in the Question. There was never any intention, so far as I am aware, to provide funds from other sources.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is that statement made with the knowledge and concurrence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover?

Mr. ATKINSON: The statement I make here is, of course, not made with that right hon. Gentleman's knowledge.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Are we to understand that this scheme has broken down? Are we to hear no more of it?

Mr. ATKINSON: "Broken down" is not the phrase to use. It has not been carried into effect because the roads have not been put in proper repair.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Is it not a fact that several county councils in Ireland have offered to repair the roads if they could secure the introduction of this motor scheme, but their offer has been refused?

Mr. ATKINSON: I must ask for notice of that.

Sir George Colthurst's Estate.

Mr. LUNDON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he is aware that some time last June the tenants of Sir George Colthurst or Lady Colthurst, in the parish of Ardpatrick, and county of Limerick, signed agreements for the purchase of their holdings: is he aware that the Hon. W. C. Trench, of Clanadfoy Kilfinane, purchased the mountain portion of the estate in which they had the right of turbary and grazing young cattle, thereby depriving the tenants of the advantages of cheap turf and rearing of some cattle; and can he state whether, in negotiations with the tenants, stipulations were made that the turbary rights should belong to the tenants, and if the tenants were compelled to pay the amount of interest usual in such circumstances; and have the tenants communicated on the subject with the Estates Commissioners; if so, with what result.

MR. ATKINSON: The mountain referred to does not form part of the estate for sale. It has been sold to Captain Trench. For some years past the tenants have ceased to cut turf on the mountain as the bog is practically cut out. The Commissioners have no knowledge of any stipulations as to turbary in the negotiations for sale. The tenants have been required to pay the interest payable under the statute pursuant to their agreements.

Gore Booth Estate, Sligo.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the sale of the Gore Booth estate, situate in the county of Sligo, has yet been ratified or agreed to by the Estates Commissioners; and, if not, whether, seeing that the town of Ballymote forms portion of that estate, and that the landlord agrees to sell to his town tenants, through the Estates Commissioners, the latter will be instructed to look into this matter with the view of having the proposed sale sanctioned.

MR ATKINSON: The lands in the neighbourhood of Ballymote on this property have been declared an estate for the purpose of sale. But the town of Ballymote was excluded from the originating application.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): Why is the town of Ballymote excluded?

MR. ATKINSON: I must ask for notice of that.

MR. O'DOWD: Is it not a fact that Boyle, on a neighbouring estate, has been sold, and was not Strokestown purchased by the Congested Districts Board?

[No Answer was returned.]

Beet Cultivation in Ireland.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that the Central Chamber of Agriculture have recently reported that beet grown in Ireland yields as much sugar as that grown in Germany; and that beet has been successfully grown on inferior bog land in the counties of Sligo and Mayo, as ordinary crops, such as mangold and turnips, are grown; and, if so, whether the attention of the Board of Agriculture will be called to this matter, with the view of establishing experimental plots for the purpose of ascertaining how far this crop can be profitably grown in Ireland.

MR. ATKINSON: The Department are aware that the Central Chamber of Agriculture issued a Report in June, 1901, dealing with beet sugar experiments carried out in 1900 in several counties in Ireland, as well as in other centres in Great Britain. They are also aware from their own experiments, a report of which appeared in the Department's Journal for February, 1901, that beet of a good quality can be grown in Ireland. They cannot, however, feel justified in recommending beet as a general crop in this country for the reason mentioned in my Answer to the hon. Member's Question of February 24th.† The obstacles to the successful establishment of the industry in Ireland are more detailed in a memorandum which I have communicated to the hon. Member.

Lugnadiffa National School.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will name the religious denomination to which the teacher of Lugnadiffa National School, near Cullooney, county of Sligo, belongs, also the religious denomination of the children on the rolls of that school on

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1212.

December 31st, 1904; will he state the name of the school nearest to Lugnadiffa, the religious denomination of the teacher, and also the name of the nearest school taught by a Catholic teacher; and whether, seeing that the patron of Lugnadiffa and Larkhill Schools is the landlord of the district, and that he has refused a site for a new school, and in view of the fact that the people of the district are mainly Catholic, the Commissioners of National Education will co-operate with the Rev. E. H. Connington, the parish priest, with the view of having the needs of Catholic children attended to.

Mr. ATKINSON: The teacher of Lugnadiffa School is a Protestant. The number of children on the rolls on December 31st last was eighteen, all of whom were Protestants. The nearest school to Lugnadiffa is that at Larkhill, the teacher of which is a Protestant. The nearest schools under Catholic teachers are at Rockfield and Ballysodare. The Rev. E. H. Connington has already been informed by the Commissioners that the proposed additional schoolhouse at Larkhill is quite unsuitable and unfitted for school purposes, and that his application for a grant would be considered when these objections were overcome.

Alleged Outrage at Woodville.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state if he has any official reports in regard to an alleged outrage at the residence of Mr. Persse, Woodville, county Galway; and, if so, whether he will state their purport.

Mr. ATKINSON: Reports have been received from the police who are investigating this matter. It is obviously impossible to disclose the purport of these confidential reports without injury to the public service.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the report that shots were fired into this house was true or false? Was it not mere sensational journalism?

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: In view of the fact that a sensational account of a desperate outrage has been published, would it not be advisable also to publish a correct statement of fact?

Mr. ATKINSON asked for notice of further Questions on this subject.

Irish Agricultural Department—Staff Grievances.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what local public bodies in Ireland have up to the present made representations to the Irish Agricultural Department regarding the dissatisfaction which exists in that Department on account of the inequality in the treatment of its staff; and what action has been taken in the matter.

Mr. ATKINSON: Six public bodies have made representations to the Department in the terms of the resolution which was proposed by the hon. Member himself at a meeting of the King's County Council and passed by that council. The receipt of these representations was acknowledged.

Palms Spread Morgan Estate.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been called to the circumstances connected with the farm forming the estate of Palms Spread Morgan, who is at present confined as a lunatic, and from which farm James J. Greene was evicted in 1889; and whether, seeing that this holding is now in the occupation of Captain Jonathan Morgan, brother and administrator of the owner, the Commissioners, having regard to his position as remainder man, will refuse to sanction an advance to Captain Jonathan Morgan to enable him to purchase this estate to which he is the heir in succession.

Mr. ATKINSON: The hon. Member has been in correspondence with the Commissioners in this matter. The property is under the control of the Court of Chancery, and an offer made by Captain Morgan to purchase the holding in question was accepted by the Land Judge in July last. The Commissioners, under the circumstances, have no authority to intervene, but in the event of their acquiring untenanted land in the neighbourhood the application of James Greene will be further considered.

De Freyne Estate.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Congested Districts Board has purchased the estate of Lord de Freyne in the counties of Roscommon, Galway, and Sligo; and, if so, whether he can state the total purchase money and the number of years purchase for the different classes of tenants, also the particulars of the arrears, current rent, and untenanted land.

Mr. ATKINSON: The negotiations have not yet been brought to a conclusion.

Case of H. J. Livingstone, of Newry.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state under what statute the Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary was empowered to forbid the execution of the warrant issued by a resident magistrate in public Court, for the arrest of H. J. Livingstone, of Newry; whether he can state the precedents, if any, for such a course; whether Fearon's solicitor was consulted as to the evidence available against Livingstone: and, if so, by whom and with what result; whether any private representations were made to any official in Dublin Castle as to the advisability of preventing the warrant from being enforced; and whether the whole question will now be reconsidered.

Mr. ATKINSON: The facts are not accurately stated in the Question. I have already informed the hon. Member that when inquiries were made to determine whether steps should be taken to obtain the extradition of the accused, if found in America, or his re-arrest and deportation to this country under the Fugitive Offenders Act, if found in Canada, it was ascertained that there was no available evidence to sustain the general charge made on the information of Fearon on which this warrant was granted in Ireland. Under such circumstances, it would be futile and improper and contrary to the practice to attempt to take action in the matter, and the Inspector-General was directed accordingly. The course taken was t e usual and proper course, and precedents frequently occur. It was Fearon's duty, when asked, to supply the evidence, which he failed to do. The district inspector consulted Fearon's solicitor and informed him of the nature of the evidence required before the Crown could take action. There is no foundation for the insinuation contained in the latter part of the Question. Of course, if sufficient evidence be at any time supplied action will be taken by the police.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is it not the fact that this man is still in Toronto, and that the Chief Constable of the city has provided the Government with his address?

Mr. ATKINSON: He is supposed to be somewhere in Canada, but we have no definite information.

Mr. KILBRIDE: He is on the railway there.

Mr. ATKINSON: He cannot be arrested unless we have sufficient evidence.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Why was he not arrested before he went there?

Mr. ATKINSON: He absconded before the issue of the warrant.

Mr. MACVEAGH: But——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! If Questions are to be treated in this way it will be impossible for other Members to ask their Questions within the time limit.

Mr. MACVEAGH: On a point of order, Sir, I want to submit the right hon. Gentleman has utterly reversed the Answer he gave the day before yesterday.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. It is not in order now to discuss whether Answers to Questions are consistent with previous Answers.

Mr. MACVEAGH: What I want to do——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, Order! I call on Mr. Kilbride——

Mr. MACVEAGH: I want to inquire——

*Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. Member will submit to my ruling.

Mr. MACVEAGH: But the right hon. Gentleman has given contradictory Answers.

Rent Reductions in Clare.

Mr. KILBRIDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction expressed by representative bodies in county Clare at the reductions of five per cent. in West Clare and ten per cent. in East Clare given by the Sub-Commission at the last hearing of fair rent applications; will he state what previous knowledge or experience had this gentleman who inspected these lands of Clare farming or the nature of Clare land and the climatic conditions of that county; and whether, in view of these expressions of want of confidence in the Lay Sub-Commissioner, he will represent to the Land Commission the advisability of transferring the services of this gentleman to a part of the country with which he has had some previous acquaintance.

Mr. ATKINSON: This Question has been referred to the Judicial Commissioners, who are at present in the country hearing appeals. Perhaps the hon. Member will repeat the Question on Monday.

Galway Harbour.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that the Harbour Commissioners of Galway had repeatedly pointed out to the late Chief Secretary the damage which was being done to the trade of the city owing to the silting of sand at the entrance to the docks, which caused great difficulty to steamers trading to the port; whether he is further aware that the late Chief Secretary promised to place a dredger at the disposal of the Commissioners; and if he can now say when the dredger will be available.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): The Board of Works, in whose charge the dredger is, have no knowledge of any communications between the Harbour Commissioners and the late Chief Secretary, or that he made any such promise as stated. The Board are now in correspondence with the Harbour Commissioners as to the date when the dredger will be available for Galway, but they are not yet in a position to state when that date will be.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN: Have not the Board of Works received a deputation asking——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN: Then may I ask if representations have not been repeatedly made during the last two years asking for the hire of a dredger?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN: I will raise the matter on the Estimates.

Telegraph Line to Scrabby.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the proposed guarantee given for a telegraph line from Granard is given in respect of a line through Cloonagh to Scrabby and not to Dring; and that the distance from Scrabby to Aghnacliffe is only two miles, and would be, moreover, the easiest way to reach that district; and, if so, pending an arrangement of the line of route which will be satisfactory to the local people, will he suspend any order made in the matter for the present.

Lord STANLEY: I am not aware that any guarantee has been proposed for a telegraph line to Scrabby. As to the other places referred to, I made a suggestion to the hon. Member in replying to his Question of the 27th ultimo,[†] and I shall be glad to wait a short time to enable him to consider whether it can be acted on.

Irish Language in the Irish Post Office.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, in reply to an application from Mr. Thomas Murphy, asking for particulars of the errors which were alleged to be in the Irish address of the letter written by him to a correspondent in Kilronan, Aran, the Post Office authorities refused to give the information; and whether, in view of the fact that the sub-postmaster of Kilronan could not read Irish, he will state who is responsible for the statement that the Irish address of the letter was incorrect, and will he state what the alleged errors were.

Lord STANLEY: The Postmaster of Galway reports that the address on the cover of the letter to which the hon. Member refers was considered by those competent to judge to be incorrect, both as regards spelling and in the formation of the Irish characters. As a knowledge of the Irish language is not at present made a condition of the Postmaster-General's appointment, and as I do not happen to know the language, I should be unable to explain the errors to the hon. Member even if I had the cover of the letter before me.

Mr. BOLAND: Who is the official responsible for the statement that there were errors in the address?

Lord STANLEY: The Postmaster of Galway.

Mr. BOLAND: Does he know Irish?

Lord STANLEY: He got information from those who are competent to judge.

Mr. BOLAND: I will put a further Question on this.

Irish Postmasterships.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state how many years service had the successful candidates recently appointed to the postmasterships of Tralee, Carrick-on-Shannon, and Arklow at the date of their several appointments; and what were the years of service of the senior applicants in each of the three cases.

Lord STANLEY: I do not think it desirable to enter into details as to the qualifications or seniority of the candidates for postmasterships from amongst whom my selection is made; but I may mention that in the case of Tralee and Carrick-on-Shannon the senior recommended applicants were officers at Sheffield and in London respectively, who did not possess all the qualifications necessary; while in the case of Arklow the senior recommended applicant was a postman unacquainted with telegraphy.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Were there no Irishmen fit for these positions?

Lord STANLEY: Yes, but these postmasterships are open to the whole United Kingdom, and there were applicants from other parts senior and more suitable.

Longford and Elphin Mail Service.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the proposed direct mid-day mail service between Longford and Elphin has yet been begun; and, if not, when he proposes to inaugurate it.

Lord STANLEY: The question of establishing a day mail service between Longford and Elphin has been carefully considered, but I regret to find that I should not be justified in giving this accommodation in view of the additional expense which would be involved. The cost of the existing service is very high as compared with the revenue from the correspondence.

War Office Purchases in Athlone.

Mr. HAYDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the War Office authorities took over the bog situate at Curramore, near Athlone; that awards for compensation to the tenants were made as far back as November 29th, 1903, and that the tenants were notified by the police authorities not to further use the bog on May 28th, 1904; and, if so, whether, seeing that the tenants have been deprived of their principal means of livelihood, though the compensation awarded them has not yet been paid, he can state when the money will be paid to these tenants.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1336.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The awards were delivered on December 23rd, 1903. No tenant was disturbed until August 16th, 1904, when possession of the portions of the Curramore turf bank which projected into the danger area was taken over by the War Department. This only affected the turf banks of ten of the twenty-three tenants, all of whom had other banks in Curramore which have not been interfered with. The necessary arrangement will, it is hoped, be completed and the money paid during the present month. The tenants concerned in the portion taken over will be entitled to interest on the purchase money.

Mr. HAYDEN: By what authority was the land taken from these people before the money was paid?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is a legal Question for which I must ask for notice.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the resignation of the Chief Secretary, it is still the intention of the Government to retain the services of Sir Antony MacDonnell as Under-Secretary at Dublin Castle.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): My hon. friend will readily understand that I could not offer any opinion upon the subordinate members of the Chief Secretary's Office until I have the advantage of the advice of the Chief Secretary. The Chief Secretary is not yet appointed, and, therefore, I fear I cannot answer the Question.

Mr. SLOAN: May I ask whether in the meantime the House is to understand that the conditions under which Sir Antony MacDonnell accepted the Under-Secretaryship have not been withdrawn, and still hold good?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Sir Antony MacDonnell, as I have explained, in my opinion, holds his office on the ordinary tenure of a Civil servant.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Has the right hon. Gentleman appealed to any of the Ulster Unionists to see if they will take the Chief Secretaryship?

An HON. MEMBER: Sloan will take it.

Mr. DELANY: Is there any reason why Sir Antony MacDonnell should be victimised to satisfy a handful of Orange bigots?

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Can the First Lord of the Treasury say whether Sir Antony MacDonnell has been informed that the particular conditions under which he accepted his appointment have been withdrawn?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have answered that by statements in debate in this House, and those statements are public.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman give us some idea when he will be in a position to make an announcement with reference to the appointment of Chief Secretary; or does he intend to leave it vacant until the dissolution?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. I hope to make an appointment very soon. The length of time the hon. Gentleman suggests for leaving the office open would be formidable indeed.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman say who is now the Minister responsible for the maintenance of the Executive Government in Ireland?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order. That does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, on the receipt by him in September, 1902, from the late Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, of the purport of the letter of Sir Antony MacDonnell, dated September 22nd, 1902, he communicated in any way to his colleagues the conditions set forth in such letter, and their acceptance by the late Chief Secretary and himself as the basis of Sir Antony MacDonnell's appointment as Under-Secretary.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no statement to make to the House, as I think I have before intimated, with regard to communications between members of the Government.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: May I ask why, as the Chief Secretary, in the hearing of the right hon. Gentleman, made a statement as to the communications between himself and the First Lord of the Treasury, the House should not have the other letters?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman is mistaken. My right hon. friend made no such statement. What he did was to read two letters, one which passed from Sir Antony MacDonnell to him, the other from him to Sir Antony MacDonnell, in which there was a reference to me.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: He went further. [Cries of "Order."] I am perfectly in order. I wish to remind the Prime Minister that the Chief Secretary went further. He not only read the letters, but told the House that he sent to the First Lord of the Treasury the purport of those letters, and received his assent.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think he did say that. [Cries of "Yes."] I may be wrong; I do not remember everything said in the House; but my recollection is that there was a phrase in one of the letters which the hon. Gentleman has in his mind, but that no comment was made by the Chief Secretary.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Did it not appear from one of the letters read to the House that a ciphered message passed to the Prime Minister?

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he communicated the fact that he had these ciphered letters submitted to him to his other colleagues?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is not on the Paper.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): With all respect, Sir, I would submit that it is on the Paper, for the Prime Minister is asked whether he communicated in any way to his colleagues the conditions set forth in Sir Antony MacDonnell's letter.

*MR. SPEAKER: I thought some other communication was referred to, because the Question on the Paper has been answered.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: No, Sir. The First Lord of the Treasury is under a misapprehension if he thinks he answered that Question, because he certainly did not answer either negatively or affirmatively whether he communicated to his colleagues the ciphered correspondence.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is perfectly right. I did not answer the Question either affirmatively or negatively. I did not answer it at all.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in expressing his concurrence with the appointment of Sir Antony MacDonnell as Irish Under-Secretary, in reply to a ciphered telegram from the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant conveying to him the purport of the letter of Sir Antony, dated September 22nd, 1902, reciting the conditions under which he accepted that appointment, this concurrence was signified by him as the head of His Majesty's Government, and is to be understood as carrying with it the collective approval of the Cabinet; and, if not, when that approval was given.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid that the hon. Gentleman must draw his own conclusions from what has already been made public.

The High Commissioner of South Africa.

MR. BRYCE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government will lay upon the Table the instrument by which the present High Commissioner in South Africa was appointed, and any other documents showing what is the nature and extent of his authority over the government of those districts of British South Africa which do not enjoy responsible government, and over the British forces in South Africa; whether it is intended to advise His Majesty to confer similar powers upon the new High Commissioner as those possessed by the present High Commissioner; or, if not, what difference will there be.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must refer the right hon. Gentleman to the Colonial Office for information as to the official publications which contain some of the documents inquired for, or as to others which could be laid on the Table. It is not proposed to make any alteration in the position of the new High Commissioner.

MR. BRYCE: Will the Papers which the Government are willing to lay contain everything to be said with regard to the position of the High Commissioner?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I would suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should move for a Return, and then my right hon. friend will be able to tell him if there is any objection.

It being now five minutes to Three o'clock four starred Questions on the Paper remained unanswered.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. BRYCE: Has the right hon. Gentleman any statement to make about the business for next week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We take Vote A and Vote 1 of the Navy Estimates on Monday, but I cannot specify the business for succeeding days. I think that the whole of next week will have to be devoted to the necessary business of Supply.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked when Part II. of the Navy Return promised would be ready?

MR. PRETYMAN replied that it would take a fortnight to prepare. Part I. had been issued.

MR. LOUGH said Part I. was quite useless. He suggested that further consideration of the Navy Votes should be postponed till Part II, was ready.

MR. PRETYMAN: Part I. was issued at the request of hon. Members.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: When will the Army Estimates be out?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I hope to lay them on the Table on Monday.

MAJOR SEELY: When is the debate on these Estimates likely to be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot say.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: I presume there will be two or three days interval between the circulation of the Estimates and the debate.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I desire to give as long an interval as I can.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures:—Sir J. Fortescue Flannery; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Llewellyn.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend The Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886," presented by Mr. Cathcart Wason; supported by Sir

Arthur Bignold, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Leveson-Gower, Mr. Harmsworth, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Lamont, Mr. Black, and Mr. Weir; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th March, and to be printed. [Bill 90.]

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS BILL.

"To promote Agricultural Education and Nature Study in Public Elementary Schools," presented by Mr. Jesse Collings; supported by Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Rothschild, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore, Sir Ernest Flower, Mr. Spear, Mr. Morrell, Colonel Webb, and Sir J. Fortescue Flannery; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 91.]

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT, 1896, ETC., CONTINUANCE BILL.

"To extend The Agricultural Educational Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance Act, 1901," presented by Mr. Long; to be read a second tlme upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 92.]

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.

"To amend the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1904, with respect to the Construction and Maintenance of Telegraph Lines," presented by Lord Stanley; supported by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Victor Cavendish; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 93.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

Class III.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £700, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on March 31st, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) said the Irish Members were placed in a very awkward position in regard to this Vote, because they had no Report from the Commission from which they could obtain any information upon the items involved, and consequently they were at a disadvantage. The amount, according to the Estimate, was intended to cover an increase in the staff which was sanctioned for the year 1904–5, but they had no knowledge as to what that increase meant. The only information they did possess as to the procedure in the office of the Estates Commissioners and of the Land Commissioners was that the work was going on most slowly. In the Return, dated December 31st, it appeared that there were 31,000 applications from purchasers in Ireland, while only 8,000 purchases had been sanctioned by the Estates Commissioners, and that showed the vast amount of arrears. Again, in regard to the evicted tenants, out of 4,000 only 131 had actually been dealt with, and he was reminded that of the 131, ninety had been reinstated by the landlords, thus leaving only forty cases dealt with by the Estates Commissioners, which made things very much worse. Last August they were told that the Estates Commissioners were not willing to take the initiative themselves in approaching landlords in regard to buying evicted farms or untenanted lands. He personally waited upon the landlords and agents in his own Division to try to get them to approach the Estates Commissioners in order to bring about negotiations, and his experience of both landlords and agents had been most unsatisfactory. Although he applied to large numbers there was only one who gave a sort of tacit consent to sell an evicted farm, and when that half-hearted consent was submitted to the Estates Commissioners it took them over six months to deal with it. Indeed, he believed that no decision had yet been arrived at in the case. If this was to be the rate of progress, when might they expect the problem of the evicted tenants to be solved? He knew there were large grazing tracts in his own county which had been brought under the notice of the

Estates Commissioners, yet he had never been able to get a satisfactory reply from that body as to what they were doing. All they had told him was that the matter was under consideration. Could the Attorney-General that day give them the information which had been asked for by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Waterford over and over again? Could he tell them whether any orders or instructions had been given to the Estates Commissioners by Dublin Castle? He did not care whether those orders or instructions were written or oral, but he did think they had a right to know what, if any, instructions had been given, seeing that last August or September the Commissioners were reluctant to take the initiative themselves in cases of purchase of untenanted or evicted farms, and that now they were actually taking the initiative.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Yes, in a different class of cases.

MR. CULLINAN: Yes, they were taking the initiative, and he would like to know whether in so doing they were acting under any special instructions of the Law Officers of the Crown, and what those instructions and orders were. Last year the hon. Member for South Tyrone made a complaint that a totally inadequate staff was employed in the office of the Estates Commissioners, and when they looked at the Returns they found that, although agreements representing a total value of £17,000,00 had been entered into within the last eighteen months, the Commissioners had only sanctioned agreements of the value of £4,600,000. He submitted that that was most unsatisfactory, and he would like to learn from the Attorney-General whether the sum asked for in the Vote under discussion was to be applied to an increase of the staff, whether the proposed increase was sufficient to relieve the pressure of business in that particular office, and would it tend to expedite the completion of sales? Would it not be better for them to have mo e f equent Reports from the Estates Commissioners as to the progress they were making in the working of the Land Act, and could they not let the House have the necessary information to enable Members to know on what grounds the objects of the Land Act were being frustrated? He could point to cases where tenants had been evicted for a long period of years, where the Estates Commissioners had sent inspectors to visit their holdings, and had then, in fixing the purchase money, based it on the original rent paid by the evicted tenant, and had offered twenty-four years purchase of that rent to the landlord, whose reply was to the effect that it was simply an attempt to confiscate his property. He would like to know what was being done to prevent the Estates Commissioners from making that progress which it was indicated would be made in the settlement of the evicted tenants' question at the time of the passing of the Land Act. At that time they had every assurance that the evicted tenants would be dealt with in a most generous manner, yet at the end of eighteen months they found that only forty evicted tenants had been dealt with through the medium of the Estates Commissioners.

He would like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether, in cases where the present occupier of an evicted farm, who had purchased the interest in that holding under the Ashbourne Acts, was willing to surrender that holding on getting compensation from the Estates Commissioners, they would take action to restore the evicted tenant, and whether they would be prepared to give an equivalent farm or compensation to the person vacating the evicted farm? On the Report stage of the Irish Land Bill the hon. Member for Waterford asked the Chief Secretary whether, under the clauses then under discussion, the Estates Commissioners would be empowered to compensate the occupiers of evicted farms with the object of restoring evicted tenants to their holdings, and whether they would be empowered to advance money for the purpose of putting up buildings on the evicted lands and of restocking the farms. The Chief Secretary replied unhesitatingly that the Estates Commissioners would have such powers. Now, they were anxious to learn from the right hon. Gentleman whether the Commissioners in the future would be in a position to deal with these cases on the lines indicated in that debate, and whether, where occupiers of evicted farms were perfectly willing to give up those farms providing the Estates Commissioners would compensate them in cash or give them an equivalent farm elsewhere, that would be done. He would like to point out that one effect of the removal of these parties out of the various localities would be to create a better feeling among the people, and to improve the men's own position by taking them to places where their presence would not excite trouble.

Another point to which he wished to invite attention was the selection of places for the sittings of the Land and Sub-Land Commissioners' Courts. He would like to point out that the Land Commissoners were in receipt of splendid salaries, and that they were allowed travelling expenses, and he did think that in fixing the places at which appeals could be heard they should study the convenience of the farmers, who were very poor, and who often, even if they succeeded, were put to an expense which many years gain, based on the extent of their success, failed to compensate them for. He thought they were justified in asking on behalf of the Irish farmers that in future the Commissioners should make arrangements to meet at places more convenient to the parties appealing. He had also a few words to say in regard to the decisions arrived at by the Land Commissioners' Courts. It was a most extraordinary fact that, while the Sub-Commissioners had been giving very small reductions—reductions which the tenants themselves considered inadequate in view of the present depressed condition of agriculture in Ireland—yet in the majority of the cases where appeals had been entered the Land Commission had actually raised the first-term rents. He called that simply monstrous, and he assured the Committee that the Members of the Nationalist Party were resolved on every possible opportunity to call attention to the working of the Land Commission in this direction.

There was still one more point to which he wished to draw particular attention. He had always considered that the zone system had proved practically ruinous to the tenants of Ireland. They found that landlords, when negotiating terms of purchase with their tenants, offered them trivial reductions and then got them to sign second-term rents, immediately afterwards instituting legal proceedings. The result was that they were terrifying them into purchasing at any price in order to save themselves. That had especially been the practice in the West and South of Ireland, and he was satisfied that many years would not pass ere a large number of tenants would find themselves ruined because of the improvident prices which were forced upon them. In his own Division he was aware of the conspiracy which existed in order to force tenants into purchasing. It was a most extraordinary fact that in one case, where the landlord demanded exorbitant terms and the tenants refused, he immediately turned round and sued these tenants for the year's rent just then due.

*The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I do not think the matters the hon. Member is now entering into are relevant to the Vote. He is perfectly right in criticising the action of the Land Commission, but he is now going further, and dealing with the general working of the land system in Ireland, and that I do not think is relevant to the Vote.

Mr. CULLINAN said he would, of course, bow to the Chairman's ruling, and he proposed to conclude at once by moving a reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £600, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Cullinan.*)

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said he desired to call the Attorney-General's attention to the promise made by the Chief Secretary that the instructions and regulations of the Estates Commissioners would be laid upon the Table of the House. In answer to a Question by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth the late Chief Secretary said that he had not yet decided upon the exact form of publication, but he agreed that the regulations should come before the House in some way. Being further pressed by the hon. and learned Member for York who represented the landlords, the Attorney-General stated that if the desire of the House was that the rules should be laid on the Table he would bring up a clause on Report dealing with the matter. Did the right hon. Gentleman doubt that that was the desire of the House? What did the Chief Secretary mean when he said that "He had not yet decided upon the exact form of publication, but he agreed that they should be brought before the House in some way."

MR. ATKINSON: Yes, I gave that promise in Committee, but it was not carried out on Report.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said that meant that the right hon. Gentleman did not carry out the undertaking he had given. It was a rule that such understandings should be religiously kept, and the right hon. Gentleman had no business to go against a direct pledge given by the Chief Secretary. He wished to know what the right hon. Gentleman meant to do in the face of what took place during the Committee stage of that Bill? Did he mean to take refuge in the plea that this great Act was to be administered by private correspondence between the Lord-Lieutenant and the Estates Commissioners? What was the object of trying to work an Act of this kind without rules and regulations? The only object of this course was to burke discussion, and that was not a legitimate object. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean to lay these regulations upon the Table of the House? If he did not, would he tell the House why. With regard to the Report of the Estates Commissioners the Committee was in an extraordinary position. They all knew what an enormous amount of work had been done under the Act of 1903. No less than £20,000,000 had been applied for, and agreements had been made under the Land Purchase Act for that amount. They all knew that the Estates Commissioners were enormously overworked, and their staff and premises were wholly insufficient. Nearly eighteen months had passed since the Act came into operation and they had not yet had any Report of the proceedings of that Department, because they refused to take the half-sheet of paper that was published as an Interim Report giving a column of figures which had already appeared in the newspapers. Was that Report to be presented at once, or were they to remain in the same position of blank ignorance of what was taking place, or were they to have a detailed Report of how this money was being spent? The House of Commons was entitled to a full Report of what was being done with the money of the people. He had in his possession the Report of the Land Commission for 1903. The practice was to issue these Reports about the month of July or August in the following year when they could not be discussed in the House. He thought they were entitled to have the principles laid before them upon which the Estates Commissioners were proceeding and acting. During the discussion of the Land Bill of 1903 a certain section of tenants were taken out of the zone system because they had no relation to the zones whatever. What actuated the House at the time in adopting this course was that those tenants had never had their rents fixed. In the case of 70,000 or 80,000 future tenants they were taken out of the zones, and Section 5, which was adopted to meet their case, was as follows—

> "In the case of the sale of an estate where an application for an advance, to which the provisions of Sub-section 1 of Section 1 of this Act do not apply, is made, the Land Commission may, subject to the limitations of the Land Purchase Act, advance the whole or part of the purchase money if they are satisfied with the security, and are of opinion that having regard to all the circumstances of the case the agreed price is equitable."

He wanted to know what the Estates Commissioners had done under that section and how it had been administered. This section referred to 100,000 tenants who had a right to that justice which the House of Commons intended them to have. Was it a fact that when the inspectors were sent to inspect such a holding all they inquired into was whether the security on the holding was sufficient for the advance? It might be a holding upon which the tenant had more property than the landlord. Was it a fact that the tenant's property was assessed as security and that the tenant was in fact buying his own property over again. Was that the way the working of Section 5 was being carried out? He did not want to know so much about the amount of money expended, but they did want to know upon what principle the Act was being administered. The declared intention of Parliament was that these tenants would not get justice under the zones system, but now they had gone out of the frying-pan into the fire. They were being plundered and robbed, and the Estates Commissioners were a party to the plunder and the robbery. The Estates Commissioners were now administering Section 5 of the Act upon the sole question of security. What did "all the circumstances of the case" mean? What did the House of Commons intend? Simply that when an inspector went to inspect a holding under that section he should discriminate between the property of the landlord and the tenant. Would the right hon. Gentleman undertake that the Report should contain the principles upon which those gentlemen were acting in regard to Section 5, and would he let them know how it was being administered?

He wanted to put another Question to the right hon. Gentleman. There was an estate—the Maher Estate—the other day brought before the House of Commons by the hon. Member for Mid.-Armagh. It was a very interesting story. He himself wanted some supplementary information in addition to that which had been obtained by his hon. friend. The hon. Member for Mid. Armagh was very anxious to find out which of the Commissioners had acted in that case. Mr. Wrench was one of the Estates Commissioners, and part of his salary, but only part, came under this Vote. The rest was safe under the Consolidated Fund. Did Mr. Wrench visit that estate? Was he the only Commissioner to visit it? With whom did he confer? Did he see the owner or her solicitor? Did he see a single one of the men who had been placed on the land? Did he see Lord Kilmaine? That was the question he wished to press, because Lord Kilmaine was at the bottom of this whole story. Did he make any report when he came back to his fellow Commissioners. Could they have that report? [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: It is privileged.] He knew it was privileged and they were not likely to get it, but all the same his hon. friend was exceedingly anxious to know about that case. He wanted to know which of the Commissioners was involved in it.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I did not mention the name of Mr. Wrench. It was Mr. Finucane I mentioned.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said he was mentioning Mr. Wrench. The hon. Gentleman went for Sir Antony MacDonnell and brought down the Chief Secretary. In this case he went for Mr. Finucane and brought down Mr. Wrench. These Gentlemen were bringing down the wrong birds. They were not good sportsmen. He asked whether Mr. Wrench was the only one of the Commissioners to visit the Maher Estate. Did he make any report of his business? What was he doing there if he did not? Whom did he see, whom did he call upon, and with whom did he stay? They would find out how this business was being administered some way or another.

He now came to another part of the proceedings. This Vote was for a sum of £700 for salaries. He asked what was the position of the business of this Commission at the present moment. Would the Attorney-General tell them what was the amount applied for at the present time.

MR. ATKINSON: I have done that.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said he wanted the information up to date. Really this was the House of Commons, and they would have get some information. The information already given was up to December 31st last and they travelled fast. They dealt in millions every month. In addition to that would he tell them how much had been paid out, how much money had been secured, and if anything was going to be done to supply money for those cases where agreements had been made and simply awaited payment of the money. Had the whole machinery been slowed down? The Secretary of the Treasury was in his place and he would be able to tell them whether the whole machinery of the Estates Commission had been deliberately slowed down because there was not nearly enough money to meet the agreements that had already been signed, lodged, and passed. The

1903 Act was a great Act of Parliament. Were they to be told that that Act, which was passed for the pacification and appeasement of the country—that the whole thing was to be brought to a dead stop and that friction was not only to go on but to be increased every day. If there were any English Members around he asked them not to be alarmed. There was no raid on the British Treasury because when he asked for more money the British Treasury was perfectly safe in their hands. There was no establishment in this country which could take better care of England in dealing with the people of Ireland and they had taken admirable care that whatever loss there was on the money, and whatever discount there was, the English Treasury would not suffer. They were only getting £88 or £89 for every £100, and that deficiency was made up purely out of an Irish fund. It did not come from Imperial sources at all. In view of the fact that £20,000,000 sterling was applied for, and that only £11,000,000 sterling had been raised, that agreements were coming in every day and the machinery was being slowed down, how were they to go on without money, and were these agreements to lie in the office in Merrion Street and landlords and purchasers alike to be placed at a disadvantage? That was a plain question and they would have to get a plain answer.

The last Question was what was going to be done about the office and staff of the Commission. The office was a perfect disgrace. There was no accommodation for the clerks, and he dared to say that if Sir Charles Cameron, the medical officer of health, were called into the place he would clear the whole place out. It ought to be cleared out. It was one of the most congested districts in the city of Dublin. The sanitary inspector ought to have been sent in long ago. Was the Attorney-General going to provide decent accommodation for this great Department of the State, and was he going to supply the Estates Commissioners with a staff competent and fit for its work. The whole thing had got into the most lamentable condition already although the Department was only eighteen months old. They were disappointing hopes and causing friction in the country which need not be caused if they dealt resolutely with the whole thing. What about those instructions, regulations, and rules? The Attorney-General had said there was no word about instructions or rules in the debate. He should not take refuge in that. The word regulations was used and that covered everything. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to redeem the promise made by the Chief Secretary at that date and give the House an opportunity of judging of the work and principles upon which that body was acting.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) said he wished to call attention to the fact that the rent-fixing machinery of the Land Commission was practically at a standstill, and that in consequence of the manner in which the sittings of both the Sub-Commission and the Head Commission were fixed considerable injustice had been done to a great number of his constituents and to people in other constituencies. When the Irish Land Act was passing through this House great hopes were aroused that it would completely change the whole face of the country, and that tenant farmers would not very much longer require to have rents fixed at all, that they would be all transformed at once into peasant proprietors, and so forth. One of the pleas which the late Chief Secretary put forward in bringing forward the Land Bill in 1903 was that the machinery by which rents were fixed was so costly and such a deadweight upon litigants and the Treasury that it should be swept away. It was swept away by setting up this comprehensive scheme of land purchase. That was very good so far as it went, and if the tenant farmers of the country had been allowed by the landlords to purchase on fair terms he had no doubt the prophecies of the right hon. Gentleman might in great part have been realised. Those who were acquainted with the working of the Land Purchase Act in Longford, at all events, knew that it had been brought to a standstill by the exorbitant demands of the landlords. He could quote quite a number of cases in support of that statement. The tenants were not allowed to purchase their holdings on fair terms, and the consequence was that they had to go into Court to have their rents fixed or revised. But in consequence of the breakdown of the rent-fixing machinery the tenants were being held like Mahomet's coffin between heaven and earth on the questions of land purchase and rent-fixing. This was working out in the interest of the landlords, and acting as a sort of lever to compel the tenants to give a higher price for the land. In answer to a Question to-day the Attorney-General acknowledged that there were 200 appeals from county Longford awaiting the consideration of the Land Commission, and that it was in 1903 that the last appeals from that county were heard. Instead of being heard in the county town they were heard at Dublin, the most inconvenient place that could have been chosen for the tenants, many of whom were poor and unable to bear the expenses of the journey and the employment of counsel to appear in their cases. The way appeal cases were dealt with in the higher Court was a perfect scandal. On two occasions within the last four years the Land Commissioners passed by Longford, going from Carrick-on-Shannon to Mullingar. And why? Because they thought they could not get proper hotel accommodation at Longford. It was their own personal convenience they were thinking of, and not the convenience of the poor people whose cases were to be heard. The management of the Sub-Commission was almost as bad. An eminent K.C., Mr. Edge, occasionally came round, and so far as that gentleman was himself concerned the list brought before him was fairly well exhausted; but many on the list of between 200 and 300 cases were adjourned by reason of the absence of the Lay Commissioners or for some other excuse. He asserted, and believed implicitly, that the wish was to suspend the operation of the Land Act of 1881 in order that it should be applied as a compulsory lever to the tenants to give larger prices for their holdings and bring them under the heel of the landlords. That was a disgraceful state of things, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman, as the chief Law Officer of the Crown in Ireland, and in the absence of a Chief Secretary the be-all and end-all of the Government system in Ireland, to take note that the Head Commision was over listed by 300 cases, that the Sub-Commissioners gave bad attendance to their duties, and that the sittings were too infrequent.

He had been very much interested in the purchase by the Estates Commissioners of the Cusack Estate in the county of Longford. This estate formed one of the most famous cases of landlord tyranny that could be brought before the House of Commons. The owner deliberately entered into possession for the purpose of wrecking the property and the homes and hearts of the unfortunate people who were cursed with him as a landlord. With a great deal of trouble he had got the late Chief Secretary to press on the Estates Commissioners the necessity of purchasing that property under the 7th Section of the Act. The Estate Commissioners sent the case on to Judge Ross's Land Court on November 7th. On the property there were 400 acres of untenanted land—the only untenanted land in county Longford on which evicted tenants could be placed. He found that the decision in the case was not a judicial decision, but it worked out that the purpose for which the land was acquired was over-ridden by the decision of Judge Ross, who accepted deliberately the applications of seven grabbers who already had holdings of their own, for the purpose of shutting out evicted tenants. If the Estates Commissioners lent themselves to a policy of that kind, then the whole of this Act was a fraud and a humbug. They would be far better without it, for all the high hopes of its doing good in settling the land question were a mockery, delusion, and a snare. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that if, in the case of this particular property, no relief was to be afforded to evicted tenants, the Irish Government might furbish up the Coercion Acts for use in the county of Longford. Then there was the King-Harman Estate in the neighbourhood of the county town, consisting of 40,000 acres. On that estate there was a Protestant tenant named Robert Armstrong, who, with his forefathers, had been for generations in occupation of a large farm from which he was evicted by the late Mr. King-Harman, a Member of that House, in 1887. The tenant who was put in possession was a bailiff on a neighbouring estate, but his security for the rent was supposed to be uncertain and the landlord only made him an eleven-months tenant. But that tenant was made a permanent tenant for the purpose of purchase, to the exclusion of the evicted tenant, who could have got any amount of security for the proper repayment of the instalments. Was that the way in which the policy of pacification was to be worked out? Was the grabber to be protected and encouraged, and the evicted tenant to be left out on the roadside?

Then there was the case of the Galbraith Estate, which was really a congested district within the meaning of the Act. Whatever powers the Commissioners had ought to be availed of; and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would call their attention to this matter. The majority of the tenants on this estate were rented at under £4; their land was mountain and bog, and their lives were made miserable by a harassing system of processing and decreeing from time to time in the Assize Court. There were 1,400 such tenants, and the greatest possible good could be done if they were granted fair terms. They were willing that the whole of the transaction should be carried through by the Estates Commissioners, and they were not anxious to strike a bargain at too low a rate. If the Act was going to work, the right hon. and learned Gentleman should direct the attention of the Estates Commissioners to the fact that the rate of interest was going on for months and years before the bargains already passed were finally closed up. That delay should be put a stop to. The landlords in some cases charged 4 per cent., and in others 3½ per cent.; but whatever the tenant paid in such cases the money was absolutely paid away, and if the Act was to work satisfactorily the money should be advanced more quickly. There was another case to which he wished to draw attention, viz., the farm of Tonnemore in the North Division of the county of Longford. On that farm 190 acres of the best grazing land were available, and these were let at present under the eleven-months system. He happened to know the gentleman who had the farm, and he would not stand between the Commissioners and the tenants if purchase terms could be arranged. He asked the right hon. and learned Gentleman not to treat this as a matter of Question and Answer, but to use his powers or influence to see that this property was bought up for the settlement of evicted tenants. There were eighty-six applications before the Estates Commissioners, and as they had at present only 400 acres of untenanted land available, it would only give five acres to each. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman could induce the Estates Commissioners to acquire this farm of Tonnemore in order to settle evicted tenants on it he would do a great deal to restore confidence in the working of the Act

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said that two points arose in connection with the debate, namely, the fixing of rents and the administration of the Estates Commissioners. It was, therefore, unfortunate that the Committee had no information in regard to the operations of the Act of 1903. He hoped that when a Return was presented it would not be a mere column of dry figures, which were appalling to the average mind and conveyed little information to the intelligent mind, but that it would show how the Act had been working in regard to tenants within the zones and tenants outside the zones, and the other various classes of tenants, so that real light might be thrown on the operations of the Act. His hon. friend had called attention to a very grave matter in connection with the administration of the Act of 1903, and its reflex action on the Act of 1881. There was at present a loss of £11 or £12 per cent. on Consols, and there would, therefore, be enormous loss in the flotation of the stock if large advances were sanctioned. In his opinion it would be better that large advances should not be sanctioned until they involved a smaller loss. Although it might be said to be opposed to the land settlement he thought that the Estates Commissioners should act rather slowly than hastily. As long as a large proportion of landlords were seeking to impose upon the tenants, and to drive them into bargains which undoubtedly would be detrimental to their future prosperity if not absolutely ruinous to them, the

Land Act of 1903, which was intended to be a great measure of appeasement and pacification, might turn out a curse rather than a blessing to the tenantry of Ireland. The Committee wou'd observe the connection between the administration of the Estates Commissioners and the present operation of the Land Commissioners. A two-fold process of procrastination and unfair treatment was in progress, and a double-edged policy of that kind was calculated to drive the tenants into improvident bargains. In the case of second-term rents the tenants were face to face with two great difficulties. One was that their cases were held over, and every possible delay was put in the way of getting their rents revised. The second and the more alarming difficulty was that the tenants were not receiving the reductions to which they were entitled, owing to the present deplorable state of agriculture, the fall in prices, increased competition, and other circumstances. Only to-day it was pointed out that the reductions only varied from 5 per cent. to 10 per cent., and the Attorney-General was only able to give a stereotyped answer. In such circumstances the tenants were being driven to purchase on terms which would be ruinous to themselves and their successors.

He would wish to refer to a few matters of detail. One was the callous indifference with which the Assistant Commissioners treated the comfort and the resources of the tenants in the matter of fixing rents. Every Irish representative would be glad if this rent-fixing business was done away with once for all, and the land question settled in a large and comprehensive way, if it could be accomplished without ruinous conditions being imposed on the tenantry. But until then the tenants would stand by the fixing of fair rents as the lesser of two possible evils. It would, therefore, be thought that the Sub-Commissioners would strive to meet the general convenience of the tenants. They had heard that afternoon of the Sub-Commissioners sitting in remote towns because comfortable hotels and bathing and golf were available. They all liked such things, but did not allow them to interfere with the conduct of their business. He had received numerous complaints from his own constituency with reference to tenants being obliged to travel forty or fifty miles to have their cases heard. When he asked a Question he was told that Killarney was more convenient for Cork tenants than Cork City itself. The real explanation, of course, was that Killarney was a very pleasant place in summer and had beautiful scenery and a salubrious climate. As regarded the action of the Estates Commissioners in connection with the evicted tenants he regretted they did not adopt a more sympathetic attitude. If such an attitude were not adopted the land settlement would turn to ashes on the lips of the Irish people. So far as he could see there was very little of the sympathetic spirit which animated the ex-Chief Secretary when the Bill was passing through the House being reflected in the action of the Estates Commissioners. He hoped that the result of the debate would be to introduce a better and a broader spirit into the administration of the Act.

An Irish Member had to comply with many requirements. He had to possess an intimate knowledge of all the Land Acts and be able to give advice to his constituents on technical points. Otherwise he was regarded as inefficient. Secondly, if he did not bring every case of hardship, be it gigantic or minute, before the House he was regarded as not discharging his duty. His hon. friend had brought several cases to the attention of the Committee, he would submit one. The Newman Estate in his constituency was recently sold, although the money had not yet been advanced. One tenant, Mr. O'Callaghan, of Dromore, a thrifty, improving, and industrious tenant, came to him in great distress and wanted to know why he had been excluded from the general bargain, as he was willing to pay the same price as the other tenants. He wrote to the Estates Commissioners and received a very unsatisfactory answer. It stated that this tenant was excluded not for any wrong he had done or the terms he required, but because the landlord wanted to resume possession of the holding. There might be disturbance and trouble if this man was evicted, and he certainly would not give up his holding without a struggle, whereas the Estates Commissioners could settle the whole matter by informing the landlord that they would not sanction the advance unless this tenant was included with the others. This question could be discussed much more adequately if the Committee were in possession of the necessary Papers and Returns, and he hoped that when the main Estimate came up hon. Members would have all the information the Irish Office could supply.

MR. GORDON (Londonderry, S.) believed that in the next few months before November 1st, which would complete two years operation of the Land Act, it was not unreasonable to suppose that from twenty-eight to thirty millions' worth of land would be agreed to be sold. There was no difference of opinion among those persons who had regard for the welfare of the country that the Act should be worked rapidly in the interests of both landlord and tenant. But what would be the position of affairs supposing that between twenty and thirty millions' worth of land were agreed to be sold, but only ten millions of money could be had to carry out the contracts? That would leave two-thirds of the purchasers hanging up and blocking future sales. There was another matter in which the tenant was greatly interested. He knew landlords who would be satisfied with 3¼ or 3½ per cent. interest until the money was advanced by the Land Commissioners. But the period during which the tenant had to pay instalments and at the end of which he was to become absolute owner of his property, did not begin to run during all the period of time that such interest was being paid. He thought that in many cases landlords were trying to make reasonable arrangements as to interest, but they were powerless in the matter. Nothing could bring into operation the beginning of the period during which instalments were to be paid before the tenant could become owner of his farm. The late Chief Secretary said he did not want more than £5,000,000 a year to be advanced. He thought that probably the right hon. Gentleman had in his mind the very low price of the Funds at that time, and the great loss there would be in dealing with large sums of money, and he might also have thought it would interfere with the money market. The last speaker was in error, he thought, in regard to the quotation of Consols. He understood that when the first loan was issued they stood at 86½ or 87½ per cent. But Guaranteed Irish Land Stock now stood at 94½. If that were so, there was 7 per cent. difference. That eased a great deal of the strain upon the Irish funds. But notwithstanding that, he thought no reasonable Irishman would be unwilling to put some strain upon them in order to hasten these land transactions.

MR. FLYNN said that in the quotation he made he was speaking of earlier transactions.

MR. GORDON said that that made the matter clear. He wished to point out that at the expiration of a year and a half they now found that money could be raised on 7 per cent. better terms. What had they to wait for? He hoped the Treasury would take advantage of a reasonably good market, and not stop at the suggested £5,000,000 a year. He believed it was the wish of hon. Members that these transactions should be hastened, and he hoped the Attorney-General would influence the Treasury to double the amount advanced and make it £10,000,000 a year. Then as to the Department, there ought to be a better staff. He did not care how efficient a man at the head of a Department might be, if he had an insufficient staff the work must be retarded. He hoped the observations made in the course of the debate that the Government desired to go slow was not well founded, but that as everybody had heartily approved of the Act nothing would be done by the Government to retard its rapid progress.

MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said that having watched very closely the working of the Land Act he thought it regrettable that they did not know exactly what had been done up to the present by the Estates Commissioners. It should be remembered that the Estates Commissioners were not a judicial body; they were strictly ministerial, and subject to the control of the House of Commons. It was, therefore, very strange that there should be any hesitation in laying upon the Table or communicating to the House in some other way the regulations under which they carried on their business. The Attorney-General would doubtless see the necessity for satisfying the House of Commons that everything that ought to be done had been done to make the Act really effectual. As to the delay, it was preposterous that cases should be pending for three years before the tenants could ascertain their position. That was the more to be deplored because, without drawing to any appreciable extent on the Imperial Exchequer, the staff could be so strengthened as to obviate this delay. There was a large number of Assistant Commissioners, both lay and legal, who, under a properly arranged system, could go round the country and fix first and second-term rents. Mr. Justice Meredith was doubtless very hard worked, but there was no reason whatever why aid should not be rendered by other Judges of the High Court. Could not some means be adopted, without throwing any additional burden on the Imperial Exchequer, by which the hearing of appeals might be facilitated and the fixing of fair rents expedited? Reference had already been made to the inadequacy of the staff. That matter and also the condition of the offices in Dublin should be looked into. One of the best suites in Dublin had been purchased, but although some months had elapsed since the completion of the purchase the staff were not yet reaping the fruits of the expenditure. If those offices were fitted up there would be ample accommodation for the additional staff which was so urgently required.

There was a feeling in Ireland that the authorities were not anxious to expedite the carrying out of this Act and that for financial reasons they did not desire to have the whole of the land of Ireland purchased within a reasonable time. That was a bad and unsound policy. The Act was passed with the idea of abolishing dual ownership, with the hope of turning every occupier into the owner of his land so as to make him a prosperous and a peaceable citizen, and it was a monstrous thing that any financial reasons should now stand in the way of the Act being fully carried out. Notwithstanding an unfortunate legal construction which had been placed upon one section of the Act, which had caused considerable delay, about £17,000,000 of land purchase contracts had been made. Cases had come within his knowledge where all the necessary steps had been taken except the payment of the money, and there was a considerable difficulty now being experienced about the landlord getting the 3½ per cent. interest which had been contracted for under the Act. He knew of cases in which all the arrangements were completed some six or nine months ago, but the landlords had not yet received the interest on the purchase money. That state of things was intolerable, and he agreed with the hon. Member for South Derry that means should be at once taken to obviate that difficulty. As there was no limit in the Act stating that not more than £5,000,000 a year should be raised, as seemed to be the impression, the money ought to be forthcoming upon reasonable terms. If more money was not advanced Ireland would be in this extraordinary position: that there might be millions of pounds worth of landed property in regard to which agreements had been consummated and all the difficulties got over, but the law would not operate until the money was forthcoming, and the occupier would be neither the tenant nor the owner, but would be under the obligation to pay the interest, which must be recovered through the Estates Commissioners. This was a most anomalous state of things and there was nothing like it in the whole Empire. The only remedy was to have a fund ready to meet all demands.

Mr. ATKINSON said he regretted that hon. Members were not in possession of the Land Commissioners' Report, which ought to show what the operations of the Act had been, and the lines upon which it had been worked. He hoped that hon. Members would be indulgent during this interregnum, when he scarcely knew whether he was the Chief Secretary, or the Attorney-General, or an Estates Commissioner, or probably, as Mrs. Malaprop said to Cerberus, "three gentleman at once." Had he known that this debate was about to take place so early in the session, and was going to range over so many subjects, he would have endeavoured to have obtained special information dealing with the particular matters, and this would have enabled him to give a much more satisfactory reply to the legitimate Questions which had been put to him. The speeches delivered had dealt with two topics: (1) land purchase, and (2) the fixing of fair rents. With regard to the fixing of fair rents, he entirely concurred with the hon. Member who mentioned the matter that three years was much too long a time for appeals to be pending. He was not in a position either to quarrel with that statement or to accept it, because he did not know what answer the Commissioners might have, or what explanation they might offer. He admitted that unless there was a very sufficient answer three years was much too long a period for appeals to be outstanding. He did not think there was any ground for the accusation made against the Sub-Commissioners that they selected places for their own convenience which were inconvenient to those who had to appear before them. He was informed that they did their utmost to choose places with the most facilities of access to meet the convenience of all concerned. They insisted upon the best possible arrangements being made for the general convenience, and for disposing as rapidly as possible of the business that came before them. As he had not received notice of this Question he could not furnish the hon. Member with any explanation, and it would not be fair under the circumstances to pronounce a definite opinion. It was the duty of the Sub-Commissioners to endeavour to accommodate and meet the convenience of all the litigants, and to endeavour to deal as expeditiously as possible with their cases. An hon. Member opposite had dealt with the reductions made by the Sub-Commissioners on appeal. That was a matter for which the Commissioners themselves were responsible. They were in a judicial position and they were bound to administer the law as it was enacted and according to their lights and notions of what was right and just. If they found that some rents were too low, of course it was their duty to raise them, and if too high to lower them. It should be borne in mind that it was contemplated that this Purchase Act would dispense with the necessity of fixing rents in a great many instances. Of course there were judicial decisions which he was not in a position either to criticise, condemn, or approve.

With regard to this particular Estimate of £700, that was required for salaries of the additional staff of the Estates Commissioners in order to promote and facilitate the purchase operations. That additional staff would consist of one examiner, one assistant examiner, one inspector of the management of estates, four estate surveyors, nine surveyors of boundaries and holdings, and fourteen second-division clerks; but all these were subordinate members of the staff.

With regard to the sales the money distributed was £4,630,000. That, owing to the figure at which the first loan was placed, practically absorbed the £5,000,000. The agreements lodged covered estates, the purchase money of which was £16,900,000. [An Hon. Member: Up to what date was that?] Up to the 28th February. Assuming that those agreements were carried out, that would leave a balance of £12,270,000. Perhaps hon. Members opposite could persuade the Chancellor of the Exchequer to advance money in sufficient sums to deal with these questions as they arose—in sums sufficient to put the Estates Commissioners in ample funds. He doubted very much whether they would succeed, the reason being that the loss in flotation would fall upon an Irish fund, which would not be able to bear it for any length of time, and the fund would not have any money available for other legitimate purposes which it was desired to supply out of that fund. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had placed a loan of £6,000,000 this year, making £11,000,000 for the two years, and in the face of the definite pledge given by his right hon. friend the late Chief Secretary that not more than £5,000,000 a year would be required for the first few years, it would be unfair to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to arrange in the first two years not for £10,000,000 but for £16,000,000 or £17,000,000. The £6,000,000 loan would probably bring in £5,340,000 which with the bonus, assuming that that amount was sold would leave £4,900,000 to be applied in purchase money, so that there would be available for purchase £5,000,000, which added to the £4,900,000 would bring up the amount for the two years to £10,000,000. No one was more convinced than himself that the two great difficulties in the way of this Act were the growth of agreements and the dearth of money.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) asked whether there would be a third flotation after March.

Mr. ATKINSON said he did not know whether that would be so, or whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer would admit that it came within the arrangement at all that a loan should be floated in 1903–4, another in 1904–5, and that a third loan should be floated in 1905.

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL pressed for some information as to whether the Estates Commissioners had received the second loan. He pointed out that sales were being delayed and if the Estates Commissioners had already had that money he would like to know how such a state of delay came about.

Mr. ATKINSON said he could not say how much had been paid out. That was how the matter stood at present. He had been requested to press the Estates Commissioners to furnish a Report and he quite agreed a Report ought to be furnished. He had made representations and the information conveyed to him was that the Commissioners were doing their utmost to bring out a Report as soon as possible. But as hon. Members must know, the framing of such a Report must take time. He could not say what the delay in getting out this Report was due to, but he had made inquiries ot the Estates Commissioners, and he was informed that it would be out in a very short time. It would, of course, require to be very carefully examined and framed by them.

Mr. CLANCY: Is it to be examined by any other person before being issued?

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Will the Treasury have the revising of it?

Mr. ATKINSON said he did not know anything about revision, but the Treasury would have to see it as it dealt with public money. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had made a vehement charge against the Estates Commissioners, and had told the House of the intention of the Act, but he would remind the hon. Member that once a Bill passed on to the Statute-book it had to be interpreted according to its wording and no one was entitled to state the intentions of its framers.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: The hon. and learned Gentleman misrepresents me. What I charged the Estates Commissioners with doing was ignoring the last paragraph of Section 5. They only had regard to the first part of the section as to the security for the advance, and ignored the second part which directed them to take the actual circumstances of each case into consideration.

Mr. ATKINSON said the Estates Commissioners were obliged to be guided by the Act of Parliament, and if they found themselves in a difficulty in regard to a point of law or the meaning of a section, as to how far it bore on a particular case, it was their business to get a decision upon it from the Judicial Commissioner. If the Commissioners had any difficulty about the interpretation of this or any portion of the Act all they had to do was to get a judicial decision on the matter from Judge Meredith. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had suggested that they were to take their law from himself.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: No, what I suggested was that if they were in a difficulty they were to take the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown.

Mr. ATKINSON said the Law Officers of the Crown had nothing to do with it. The only persons he was called upon to advise were the Chief Secretary and some Departments of the Government, but provision was specially made in the Land Act in order that the Commissioners might get their legal directions from an independent source unconnected with the Government whenever a point of difficulty arose. It was not at all necessary that parties should go on their own motion in any particular case for a judicial decision. He was not aware that they had raised the point in question in any particular case.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): What the right hon. Gentleman has said now is very important, namely, that it is not necessary that the point should be brought before the Judge by the party interested and that it can be brought before the Judge by the Commissioners.

MR. ATKINSON stated that what he said was that if the point arose in any particular case they could of their own motion bring it before the Judge and get his decision. He did not say that the Judge was to entertain abstract questions or applications, but if any particular case arose in connection with any case before them they could immediately refer that to the Judicial Commissioner and get his decision upon it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask in regard to Section 5 whether in the case of any estate where the Commissioners are dealing with non-judicial tenants, the Commissioners can on their own motion go to Judge Meredith and ask a proper interpretation of the concluding words of that section, and that they should take into account the equities of the case. Have they done that in this instance?

MR. ATKINSON said he was not aware that they had. Possibly the matter had not been before them.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Has it not?

MR. ATKINSON: If it has the fault was theirs. If any non-judicial tenant came before them, they could make a ruling upon the case and decide according to Section 5, and if there was any doubt about the ruling the landlord or the tenant, if they desired it, could get a decision from the Judicial Commissioner. This provision was specially designed in order that the Commissioners should get their law from the head of the Commission to which they belonged, and that they were not to take their law from any Law Officer, whoever he might be. Hon. Gentlemen sometimes found fault with the Commissioners for not doing something they wished them to do, or something that they thought it fair and right they should do, without ever asking themselves if they had any power to do it. If the statute did not give them power they could not do it. They were bound by the powers conferred upon them, and on this question of the evicted tenants some Gentlemen who had addressed the House thought that the Estates Commissioners had much larger powers than in point of fact they had. It was only under Section 8 that they had power to buy land, and that was in reference to a sale or intended sale of an estate. It was ancillary to that sale that they got land for the purpose of enlarging holdings, and for the purpose of reinstating evicted tenants. Many hon. Gentlemen supposed that if on a landlord's estate there were two evicted farms they could go down to the landlord and say, "Will you sell these two evicted farms without the rest?" The landlord said, "I cannot do that. I will sell the whole of the estate, but I will not sell these two evicted farms apart from others even for the sake of reinstating these men." The Commissioners had no power to make the landlord sell in such a case, and any attempt to do it would lead to great confusion.

MR. CLANCY: Have any instructions been issued to the Commissioners on that matter, or has any Minute been made with reference to it.

MR. ATKINSON said he would come to the Minutes later. He would deal with the matter altogether when he came to it. He admitted the other night and he admitted now that it would be desirable that the purchase of these different estates should progress at a much quicker rate, but unfortunately the Commissioners were not able to secure untenanted land sufficient to carry out the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. But it must be always borne in mind that the main purpose of this Act of Parliament was to turn occupying tenants into owners. No doubt that hope had not been so quickly realised as was desirable, but it must be remembered that all the untenanted land that the Commissioners so far had obtained was 6,000 odd acres. They were in treaty for 30,000 acres more, and they hoped to be able to obtain them. When they did so the progress would be very much accelerated.

The hon. Member for South Tipperary had asked if the Commissioners had any power to advance money to evicted tenants for the purpose of stocking their farms. The hon. Member must have forgotten that he stated the other night that forty-six men who had been reinstated had been advanced free grants amounting to £3,311.

MR. CULLINAN: What I asked was if the Estates Commissioners could assist the evicted tenants, whether they purchased under the Ashbourne Act or any other Act.

MR. ATKINSON said he had been under a misapprehension on that point. The Commissioners had done so in every case without adding to the purchase money at all. On August 13th, 1904, the hon. Member for South Kildare asked whether the attention of the Chief Secretary had been directed to a letter from the Estates Commissioners to Mr. John Purcell, Arless, Queen's County, representing P. J. M'Laughlin, an evicted tenant, then in America, and the Chief Secretary replied—

> "The hon. Member has been good enough to furnish me with a copy of the letter in question. But some misunderstanding seems to exist because the apparently simple question, 'Can the Estates Commissioners make an advance for the purpose of compensating a tenant for leaving his holding?' raises several issues which in reality are distinct. (1) In the case of a holding forming part of an estate which is not 'purchased or proposed to be purchased' no advance can be made. Such a case is outside the scope of Section 12 of the Irish Land Act, 1903. (2) In the case of a holding forming part of an estate 'purchased or proposed to be purchased' compensation may be paid, under Sections 12 and 43, for the 'benefit or improvement' of that estate, or 'generally for the purposes' of the Act, one of which is the restoration of evicted tenants in connection with a transaction for sale. (3) The suggestion that compensation may be paid for this purpose seems sometimes to be made in respect of a third category of cases, viz., where the present holder has purchased under a previous Land Act. On such cases I express no opinion, and refer the hon. Member to the reply given on July 19th to the hon. Member for Tipperary South."

MR. CULLINAN asked whether a tenant who had purchased under the Ashbourne or any other Act an evicted farm and was willing to dispose of his interest was entitled to compensation in cash or an equivalent farm.

MR. ATKINSON refused to answer that, and for this reason, his opinion would bind nobody but himself. The Estates Commissioners might take no notice of it, and he had no power to make them act on the opinion he gave. It was a very difficult and nice question. If a question of that kind came up they would have no difficulty in sending it to Mr. Justice Meredith in order to have it decided one way or another.

MR. CULLINAN asked whether the Estates Commissioners had any power in a case where a planter was willing to surrender a farm.

MR. ATKINSON said he could not answer the question off-hand, and even if he did answer, he did not know that any person would be bound by it.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL asked if the right hon. Gentleman could give any information about the Maher Estate.

MR. ATKINSON said the only information he had about that estate was what he gave the other day. The only other matter which he thought it necessary to deal with was the question of the regulations, and he confessed that he felt very great difficulty in approaching it, because whatever he could say could have no binding effect on whoever might be appointed to the important office of Chief Secretary for Ireland; and, indeed, it would be most unfair for him to endeavour to outline or suggest any policy which the successor of his hon. friend the Member for Dover might deem it right to adopt. He knew the policy that his right hon. friend pursued, as he had indicated the other day, but on this question of the position of the Estates Commissioners it would be necessary to make up one's mind as to what they were. Were they Judges regulating their conduct by published rules, independent as long as they acted within those rules, or were they Civil servants for whom rules might be prescribed, but in addition to which they might get instructions? Then he turned to the Act and the speeches which were made in the House to see what it was contemplated they should be. The 8th sub-Section of the 23rd Section of the Act of last year purported to fix their position. It was to the following effect—

> "The Estates Commissioners, in carrying out the foregoing provisions of this Act, shall be under the general control of the Lord-Lieutenant and shall act in accordance with such regulations as may be made by him from time to time."

In the last section of the Act there was a provision about the rules. When the clause, which was ultimately crystallised in the form in which it appeared in the Act, was under discussion in Committee, his hon. friend the Member for York objected to the Lord-Lieutenant having any daily intercourse or daily communications with the Estates Commissioners.

> "What was objected to," he said, "was that in carrying out the provisions of this measure they should be subject to the daily and hourly control of the Lord-Lieutenant. It could not be right for the Lord-Lieutenant to give directions that the Commissioners should buy a particular estate or give a particular price. If that were done the Commissioners would be prejudiced in the discharge of their duty, and he was unable to say what other meaning could be placed on the words."

The hon. Member for Longford then intervened and said that—

> "The words, when taken in connection with those that followed seemed to lend themselves to some extent to the criticisms which had been made."

He agreed that these gentlemen were to be executive officers, and there was no harm in making it perfectly plain that the Government were responsible for their conduct. That being so, the Government must be able in a general way to regulate the course which the Commissioners should pursue, and that object was secured not only by the tenure of the office, but also by the words—

> "Shall act in accordance with such general regulations as may be made by the Lord-Lieutenant."

But when the two provisions of this sub-section were taken together it seemed to be intended that the Lord-Lieutenant should exercise a daily and hourly control over the detailed performance of the work and the determinations of the Commissioners in regard to particular estates.

> "He thought that could hardly be intended," said the hon. Member, "and it would be well if the right hon. Gentleman explained exactly what the words did mean."

Then his (Mr. Atkinson's) right hon. friend replied that the hon. Member—

> "must be aware that a member of the Government could not interfere minutely from day to day in the detailed work of a great Department. These words merely meant general control and guidance, the Government being responsible for the success of the Act. The Government would not interfere in regard to a particular estate or as to the sphere of the operation of the Commissioners. But seeing that the Government of the day would be criticised in Parliament if the hopes raised in the course of the debate were disappointed, it might be right for them to have a word as to whether the energies of the Commissioners should be directed towards dealing with congestion or some other of the objects of the measure."

Then the hon. Member for Louth intervened and made a pointed speech. He said—

> "That in the administration of a new body with large funds at its back it would be intolerable if the Chief Secretary of the day, who would be constantly subject to criticism in Parliament, had not a directing voice. Especially would that be the case in regard to the present Chief Secretary, who was responsible for this Bill. If the measure failed to work satisfactorily the right hon. Gentleman would be attacked on all sides, and it would be impossible for him to defend his position, unless he could say he had given the necessary directions or something to that effect. It would be a satisfaction if the Committee could be told whether the regulations to be prescribed, were to be published, or submitted to Parliament. He would suggest that they should be laid on the Table of the House with power to present a prayer against them if necessary."

The hon. Member for Longford again intervened, and said—

> "There was a great deal to be said for the position of the Chief Secretary, so long as the interference of the Executive Government was directed to the principles of actions, to seeing that the Act was carried out in the spirit in which it was intended, and did not extend to the minor details of judgment and so forth."

Now, it would be observed that the hon. Member for Louth dealt with two things, first, the general regulations, and asked how they were to be published; but he also dealt with the control and interference for the general purposes of the Government with the Commissioners. They were to make regulations, but in addition to regulations, and outside them, it was competent to control the Commissioners on general lines but not to interfere in particular instances. In reference to that his right hon. friend said that—

> "He had not yet decided the exact form of publication, but he agreed that the regulations should come before the House in some way."

That was quite so.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: You did not say that yesterday.

MR. ATKINSON said that subsequently the hon. Member for York proceeded to state that—

> "This Act was going to work for a considerable number of years before it was worked out, and therefore he did not like the Lord-Lieutenant to be able to lay down any regulations he liked."

And the hon. Member moved an Amendment to add the words—

> "And such regulations shall be deemed to be statutory rules within the meaning of the Rules Publication Act of 1893."

The question was put that those words be there inserted. Then he himself interposed and said that he had no objection to the proposal of the hon. Member, but some other form of words would be necessary if the rules were to be laid on the Table of the House. [AN HON. MEMBER: Rules?] That must have meant regulations, for they were then speaking of regulations. Then he went on to say that if it was the desire of the House that the rules should be laid on the Table of the House he would bring up a clause on Report dealing with the matter.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that the right hon. Gentleman had omitted the fact that in consequence of that statement the hon. Member withdrew his Amendment—viz.: on the understanding that the rules would be laid on the Table of the House.

MR. ATKINSON: Quite so. He (Mr. Atkinson) said that if it was the desire of the House he would bring up a clause.

AN HON MEMBER ON THE IRISH BENCHES: Why did you not?

MR. ATKINSON said he did not do it because he was thrown over; and when the Bill came up on Report and a further Amendment was introduced he had not charge of the Bill. The pledge he had given seemed to others unacceptable; and that it was not desirable to lay the rules on the Table of the House. Accordingly an Amendment was introduced which limited the provision as to disclosing the regulations to the rules referred to in Sub-section 13. The provision in the Bill then read—

> "On page 14, line 14, add 'these reports and rules under the last preceding sub-section': *i.e.*, Sub-section 13."

He quite admitted that he said in Committee that if it was the desire of the House he would bring up a clause. On the Report he was not in charge of the Bill; but in Committee he was put up and told to say that. On consideration on Report his right hon. friend did, as he was perfectly entitled to do, change his mind.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that the hon. Member for York withdrew his Amendment in Committee on the distinct promise—on an undertaking given to the House of Commons that that would be done. The right hon. and learned Gentleman now said that he did not fulfil that promise because he was thrown over. But did he not make any explanation to the House?

MR. ATKINSON said he did not think he was required to make any explanation to the House at all. He was not in charge of the Bill, but his right hon. friend who was in charge of the Bill did not make the Amendment on Report, and nobody objected.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: But you made a promise.

MR. ATKINSON: But my right hon. friend was in charge of the Bill.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): May I ask if you were in charge of the Bill at the time when you made the promise?

MR. ATKINSON: No, Sir. Certainly not.

Mr. CLANCY: Who threw the right hon. and learned Gentleman over.

Mr. ATKINSON said he quite admitted that his right hon. friend did say that the regulations should be published to the House in some form. He himself had never said anything to the contrary. A Question was asked on February 2nd by the hon. Member for East Mayo of the late Chief Secretary as to whether any instructions in connection with the administration of the Land Act had been issued by the Lord-Lieutenant to the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, would they be laid on the Table of the House. His right hon friend's Answer was this—

> "No such instructions have been issued to the Estates Commissioners; the hon. Member may, however, have in view the instructions to be issued by the Estates Commissioners for the guidance of the inspectors. The laying of these instructions on the Table of the House is under consideration."

He was again pressed for a further reply by the hon. Member for East Mayo as to whether any instructions had been issued, and he said there had been a Departmental instruction sent out, and he would consider whether it should be laid. Then the hon. Member for South Tyrone asked the late Chief Secretary whether he had not given a definite promise that instructions should be laid before Parliament. To that he replied—

> "There is a distinction to be drawn between Departmental instructions and ordinary regulations."

If that did not meet the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite it was not his fault. His right hon. friend contended that there had been no regulations made within the meaning of Section 23, Sub-section 8, of the Act, and that all that he did, viz., to convey a Departmental communication to the Estates Commissioners, was done in accordance with the power that was reserved to him and discussed at the time the Act was passed. It was never contemplated at that time that the only communication he could make to the Estates Commissioners was in the form of a general regulation. No general regulations of that kind had been made, and therefore his right hon. friend thought that he had not failed to fulfil his pledge that he would publish general regulations. He understood that the late Chief Secretary regarded those instructions as confidential and that they should be communicated to nobody. Of course his successor might take a different view of the matter. Until, however, that successor was appointed, it would be quite improper for him to enter into any obligation, or give the House any pledge which he might not be able to carry out. He was not in a position to give any pledge on behalf of the late Chief Secretary's successor. The position of the Commissioners had to be considered. If it were right that under the provisions of the Act they should be in the position of ordinary Civil servants of the State who took orders from their superior, then if these instructions were confidential, they should be confidential for all parties and kept secret from everybody. If, on the contrary, they were to be disclosed by either side they should be disclosed by both. That was the ordinary rule in regard to Civil servants and no Civil servant would be right to disclose the confidential communications of his superior without the concurrence of all parties concerned.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN asked if there was any confidential document in Dublin Castle?

Mr. ATKINSON said he was afraid that according to the debate there were very few. If it were desirable to put these Estates Commissioners in the position of Judges they should be governed by a set of rules published to the world. Then they could have the protection which the Government took upon itself in reference to Civil servants who were bound to do as they were told and were saved from all blame so long as they acted within the instructions given them by their superiors.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) said that they had been led to believe that the regulations would be issued and laid on the Table in order that they could see whether they were framed on the lines and intentions of the Land Act. He could not come to any other conclusion than that some "hugger-mugger" or hidden work was to be laid at the doors of the Estates Commissioners which would prove injurious to the tenants. He sympathised thoroughly with the complaints made as to the action of the Sub-Commissioners in different parts of the country. In every district there appeared to be a denial of justice by reason of the delay that had taken place in the sittings of the Sub-Commissioners. In Killarney, appeals lodged five years ago had not yet been heard, and any reasonable person must come to the conclusion that the tenants were placed in a very awkward position, and were badly handicapped. Let the Committee compare the Land Commissioners' work with the fixing of rents in the County Courts. The latter took up the applications and disposed of them in three months, and it was hard to understand why the Head and Sub-Commissioners had to delay for years in dealing with questions of so much greater importance to people in the different districts.

He desired to intervene in the debate on behalf of the evicted tenants of Kerry. Out of 411 applications lodged not one single case had been dealt with by the Estates Commissioners in the matter of restoring them to their holdings. It was satisfactory to note that in the majority of Kerry cases no planters were in occupation of holdings from which men had been evicted. Possibly that was because men could not be found to occupy the holdings, but if the holdings were untenanted and no effort made to effect such an object surely a stronger case was made out than where planters or grabbers were already in occupation. In one case a gentleman of position named Magill, who had one of these farms, instead of being negotiated with by the Estates Commissioners, was appointed one of their inspectors for the transaction of business under the Land Act. It was setting at defiance both justice and fair play that such a man should be in receipt of a salary from the Commissioners who were expected to deal fairly with the evicted tenant. In another case he, although without influence with the landlord, had been able to effect the reinstatement of an evicted tenant for the mere asking it of Mr. Coltsman, the landlord. Previous to his taking that step they had sent several letters and applications to the Estates Commissioners, and had made every possible effort to get the evicted tenant reinstated, but without avail, and they were compelled to take their own course. He had also made representations to the Estates Commissioners that owing to the number of years the tenant had been out of occupation, to his poverty and difficult position, he was entitled to some assistance; but although twelve months had lapsed since the reinstatement, and various reports had been made regarding that particular evicted tenant, nothing had been done beyond a promise that the case would be considered by the Commissioners. What was true of those two tenants applied equally to other estates in Kerry. The inspectors of the Estates Commissioners apparently made inquiries, but they resulted in no satisfactory treatment of the evicted tenants. Another case was to be found on the estate of the Earl of Kenmare in Killarney, where an evicted tenant, who had been out of his holding fifteen years, was still claiming to be reinstated. A fair rent had been fixed before he was evicted and he owed only one year's rent. He went out on the "Plan of Campaign" and in defence of the other tenants; the landlords' agent was written to, but declined to let to the evicted tenant, and although the farm was vacant and the Estates Commissioners had been appealed to, nothing had been done. But a worse case was to be found on the Collis Sands Estate, where the landlord had agreed to sell, and the tenant had agreed to buy, and yet no definite arrangement had been made. The result was that tenants were determined not to pay rent until the landlords dealt fairly with them, and the landlords were determined to obtain high prices, even if they had to resort to writs and other processes of intimidation. Thus the whole parish was in a state of turmoil and disorder, whereas if a reasonable bargain had been allowed the parties would have been happily situated. It appeared to him that if anything was to be done for the evicted tenants it must be effected by raising their voice in Parliament and getting the people to agitate at home. The Attorney-General could only be regarded as a stop-gap in the absence of the right hon. Member for Dover, which they all regretted, but he would express the hope that some good might yet be done for the evicted tenants, who were the most deserving and needful section of the people, and that negotiations under the Land Act might be in the future carried out in a more reasonable manner than had been the case during the last two years.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) asked whether the hon. and learned Gentleman could say how long the extra staff had been employed, because if they were to be employed for any considerable time, in his opinion the Vote was insufficient. It was notorious throughout Ireland that the block in the way of completing transactions was due first to the want of money, and second to the length of time necessary for the completion of the process of examination and inspection, and if this £700 now asked for was for the payment of the staff mentioned for another year, it was quite evident by the experience of the past that that staff was insufficient to get through the work.

Passing to the larger question, he understood the hon. and learned Gentleman to say that the amount available each year for land purchase would be £5,000,000. Up to the present there had been £11,000,000, £5,000,000 for the financial year 1903–1904, and £6,000,000 for the financial year 1904–1905. In a few days, when the next financial year commenced, there could be another flotation of stock for another £5,000,000, and the result of that would be that £16,000,000 would be all the money available to meet the whole of the transactions up to March 31st, 1906. In the meanwhile applications kept pouring in. Those already in represented something like £16,000,000, so that they would absorb the whole of the purchase money that could be expected to be available up to the 31st of March, 1906. Yet bargains were being made and applications were coming in. There would be very long delays between the signing of the agreement and the vesting order, which was, to say the least, unfortunate. It had a great disturbing influence in Ireland, and it appeared to him that if the money was not to be got to meet the demands as they came in, some notice should be published by the Government warning both landlord and tenants that under the circumstances any agreement arrived at must remain in abeyance for many months. This was an important matter. He did not complain of the delay, because it arose from the unanticipated success of the Act of 1903, but, the conditions having arisen, in his opinion the Government ought to take some steps, either to ameliorate them, or if they could not do that they should at least let it be known that the agreements between the landlords and the tenants would, after they had been signed, be shelved for many months, perhaps years, to come.

*MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory) said it was very necessary for the Estates Commissioners to have proper clerical assistance, because from his personal experience they could not even acknowledge a letter in less than fourteen days. He, however, did not see any necessity for this £700 Vote at all. The staff at the Four Courts had practically nothing to do except read the newspaper all day, and the same state obtained in other Departments, consequently there was no need whatever for this extra expenditure, as clerks might have been transferred from other offices. Twenty inspectors had been appointed by the Estates Commissioners, but in reply to a Question the Attorney-General had been unable to give any information as to their creed, knowledge, or previous experience. As to the evicted tenants, according to the official Returns there were 215 evicted tenants in Queen's County of whom only one had been restored. That was an even lower rate than in the rest of the country. Out of 5,500 evicted tenants in Ireland only forty-six had been restored by the Estates Commissioners, and ninety by the landlords, so that at that rate it would take forty years to settle the evicted tenants question, upon which settlement depended the whole success of the Act and the peace and contentment of the country. On the Marquess of Lansdowne's estate there were forty-nine evicted tenants, not one of whom had been restored by the Estates Commissioners. He wished to know whether they had approached the planters in the matter, or whether any communications had passed between the Estates Commissioners and Lord Lansdowne with regard to the reinstatement of these tenants. Another case was that of the Caldbeck Estate, one-half of which consisted of untenanted land. That land had been parcelled out between the big graziers, business men, and the bailiff himself, although there were thirty-four tenants whose holdings were absolutely uneconomic and who under the Act had a right to a fair share of the land. Were those men to be swindled out of their rights? When the inspector went down to the estate he travelled with the agent, met the bailiff at the village, and lunched with the biggest grazier. His report, however, could not be procured; it being held to be privileged. He protested against this arrangement being sanctioned by the Commissioners, seeing that under it the whole intention of the Act was being completely defeated.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 218; Noes, 246. (Division List No. 34.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, G. M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptE.C(S. Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, V. P. (Cavan, W.)
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, H. A. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell

Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur W. (N. Dorset)
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manc'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj'min
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J A. (Glasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (W'rc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir J. (Monmouth)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks N R
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, A. B. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Rt. Hon. J. P. (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.EH (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. SirWilliamH
Warde, Colonel C.E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley,H. (Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he had not had the advantage of hearing the speech of the Attorney-General, but he had got what he believed was a fairly adequate summary of it. He wished to return to the subject of the *status* of the Estates Commissioners at the point where the right hon. Gentleman left it. He would read the passage in the speech of the late Chief Secretary dealing with that subject when the Land Bill was in Committee. It was to be found in *Hansard*, 1st July, 1903. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "He would like to define the attitude of the Government step by step. During the long conferences which preceded the introduction of the Bill, and on almost every clause, he had laid the greatest stress on the administrative character of the new Commission. That the new Commission should be of an administrative character was not merely his personal opinion, it was an integral part of the policy of the Government. He could not have persuaded his right hon. friend to sanction the use of large public funds for purely executive work except upon the basis that those who administered them were to be in a very real sense executive officers, subject in all matters of policy, and the economic and proper use of the funds, not only to the control of the Government, but to the criticism of the House."

The late Chief Secretary was certainly a master of lucid exposition, and no language could be more explicit than that passage. There was no single statement in connection with the Bill the meaning of which was more palpable than the one he had quoted. All would agree that they had a right to criticise the action of the Estates Commissioners. It was intended that they should be under the constant control and criticism of the House. To him it was axiomatic from that proposition that the Committee must know the instructions under which the Estates Commissioners did their work if they were to be criticised. Let the Committee see the position in which they were placed by the startling statement of the Attorney-General. The right hon. Gentleman said, "It is quite true that I gave a pledge that these instructions should be made public."

MR. ATKINSON: These "regulations?"

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that he was instructed to give that pledge, and that then he was thrown over. He said he was not in charge of the Bill. They must assume, therefore, that he was thrown over by the Gentleman in charge of the Bill, namely, the late Chief Secretary. They had a subordinate officer of the Government telling the House of Commons that, having on instructions given a deliberate pledge, he was overthrown by his superior. There had been such remarkable relations between different members of the Government that he had ceased to be startled at anything they might do. When he read a speech by the Chief Secretary in favour of one policy, and when he found a strong denunciation of that policy by the Attorney-General, he was in doubt whether the Chief Secretary had thrown over the Attorney-General or the Attorney-General had thrown over the Chief Secretary. They were accustomed to the ordinary constitutional reserve which was observed between Ministers, but this was a startling new development on which he would make further comment. He would look at the situation in which Members from Ireland were placed. They got an undertaking from a representative of the Government, and if that undertaking was not carried out they were deprived of the means of criticising the Commissioners. A pledge given to the House of Commons by one Minister was beyond the power of any other Minister to recall. The Irish representatives had strong reason to complain that the Attorney-General should have allowed himself to be thrown over, and further they had reason to complain that when he was thrown over they were not told of the matter so that the House might have dealt with it.

MR. ATKINSON: I told the House that words would be brought up on Report.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said the Attorney-General did not bring up words on Report, and the only explanation he gave was that he was thrown over by his hierarchical superior. The result was that a solemn pledge given to the House was broken. That was a flagrant breach of the old practice of that Assembly—a practice without which no business could be brought forward and properly and decorously discussed, namely, that a pledge given by a Minister was one from which he had no right to recede except with the consent of those to whom it was given. It was a most discreditable transaction. He supposed that the next Chief Secretary would not be an Irishman, but a man of the superior nationality who thought they had a right to manage the affairs of Ireland. When he saw the Attorney-General, an Irishman, with long years of office, thrown over by an English Chief Secretary, his sympathies gushed forth towards the right hon. Gentleman in the humiliating position in which he had been placed. He renewed his strong complaint that a breach of faith had been committed.

So much in regard to form; he would now come to substance. They had been promised the right to criticise the Estates Commissioners, but they were without the materials to do so on the very point on which, above all others, they wanted material. So far as the transactions between landlord and tenants for the sale of land were entered into, these merely concerned the two parties, and the bargains might be either good or bad. There was no power on those benches by which transactions of that kind, sanctioned by the Estates Commissioners, could be revised; but the action of the Estates Commissioners in regard to the evicted tenants was primarily and mainly executive, and was a matter which affected every section of the people of Ireland, and the whole of the land policy of which the Land Act was the expression. Everybody knew that the Land Bill would not have got one vote from any single man on those benches if they had thought that the evicted tenants were going to be deserted. The supreme and vital part of the Land Act was that relating to the evicted tenants, and the Chief Secretary, as long as the Bill was under discussion in that House, and Lord Lansdowne in another place, cordially accepted that proposal. The

Bill became law, and the Estates Commissioners were appointed. He did not know one of them except as a nodding acquaintance; but he had read in the public Press that the Estates Commissioners had been most anxious to deal with the evicted tenants. The right hon. Attorney-General admitted that, somehow or other, the work had not been done. If that was the fault of the Estates Commissioners let the House of Commons know. If the Irish Members could be persuaded that the blame for the manner in which this question had been tinkered with could be laid at the door of the Estates Commissioners, he could assure the Committee that the Estates Commissioners would get the full measure of Parliamentary criticism promised in the speech of the late Chief Secretary. If it was not the fault of the Estates Commissioners, let the House of Commons know. If this great question, which lay at the root of social order in Ireland, which was almost what he might call its poisoned root, was not settled, they had a right to ask who dared prevent it. For that settlement thousands of unhappy beings had been looking, yearning, and longing for ten, twenty, thirty years, hoping that they might be permitted to return to their untenanted houses and desolated farms. In the sporting phrase of his hon. friend behind him he wanted to saddle the right horse; to find out the criminal in order that they might frame an indictment against him.

All that the Attorney-General could do was to say, "I promised to give you the material for criticism; I was overruled; I am still like the peri at the door of Paradise awaiting with tremulous anxiety, not unmixed with apprehension, the name of the gentleman who is to succeed to the vacant office of Chief Secretary." To what base uses this Chief Secretaryship, which was once the most important position in the Cabinet, must have come, that it was now going a-begging from one Minister to another? Was there even a poor, shuffling, callow Under-Secretary who would think it worth his while to pick it out of the gutter? This was the apotheosis of Unionism. The Attorney-General was waiting for his new hierarchical chief, and he could promise the right hon. Gentleman that it would be far more easy for him when the typical Saxon, with a fine colossal, hide-bound, rhinoceros-laden ignorance of Irish affairs, arrived as a new Chief Secretary. He pressed upon the hon. and learned Attorney-General the necessity, at the very first consultation he had with his new chief, of impressing on that Gentleman, whoever he might be, the propriety of making no pledges that he could not fulfil, and the absolute necessity of his keeping faith with Parliament and giving to the House the information promised. This matter could not be left where it stood. He was sure that they would have the assistance of the hon. and learned Gentleman in pressing upon his new chief the duty, the honour, and obligation to give the information required. When that information was forthcoming they would be able to deal with this question which for twenty years had been a source of sorrow and astonishment to Ireland.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) said the restoration by the Estates Commissioners of forty-six, and by the landlords of ninety odd evicted tenants was not a very great result to show for a year and a half's working of the Land Purchase Act of 1903. In fact, it was an exceedingly poor result. There were, they were told, 4,550 applications for reinstatement, some from America, some from Australia and other countries, and he was glad to hear the hon. and learned Gentleman say he did not intend to make any point of that fact. He quite admitted that some of those claims might not be genuine, but the enormous bulk of them were, and the hon. and learned Gentleman might minimise them as much as he could, but still the forty-six restorations by the Estates Commissioners stood out as a miserable result of the working of the Act of 1903 in this regard. Out of the £250,000 at the disposal of the Estates Commissioners for the reinstatement of evicted tenants they had spent something like £3,500, which came to about £72 each tenant. Could the hon. and learned Gentleman say whether those forty-six tenants had been restored to their own holdings, or whether in that number he included those for whom other farms had been found. He himself believed that the Irish land question would never be settled to the satisfaction of Ireland, or to the advantage of the House until every evicted tenant was restored to the holding from which he had been evicted. He himself was the first tenant evicted under the Plan of Campaign, and he never had, and never would go back from anything he did on that occasion. Given the same circumstances and conditions, he would do to-morrow what he did then. He had taken the rough with the smooth side of Irish political life, as the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite knew, and the hon. and learned Gentleman had used every device of the law to give him penal servitude. But when he arrived in that House he neither attacked the hon. and learned Gentleman nor complained. He was one of those who preferred the rough tongue of the hon. and learned Gentleman to the smooth tongue and smiling manner of the late Chief Secretary the right hon. Member for Dover. In the one case he always knew where he was and in the other case he never knew where he was. The hon. and learned Gentleman had never deceived him. He always knew that in the hon. and learned Member he had an opponent, skilful and learned in the law, to fight, who would use every trick and device of the law to put him into jail and keep him there. He did not complain, and frankly admitted that if, under different circumstances, the hon. and learned Gentleman had to deal with him, as through the mercy of providence he might have to, yet he would do the same by him.

With reference to the question he had asked that day as to the reduction of rents in county Clare, he asked the hon. and learned Gentleman to remember that some of those rents were fixed as first-term rents before 1884. Rents in West Clare were reduced by 5 per cent., and in East Clare by 10 per cent. He could not understand how any Commissioner, acquainted with the nature of the land, and having regard to the reduction in the prices of agricultural produce, could come to the conclusion that a reduction of 5 per cent. on a second-term rent could result in a fair rent, when the first-term rent had been fixed before 1884. He drew attention to the fact that one of the Sub-Commissioners who was sent to fix these rents in Clare, where the land was principally crag land and bog land, came from county Wexford where such classes of land were almost unknown, and the result was that, instead of proper valuation being made, these ridiculous reductions of 5 per cent. for West Clare and 10 per cent. for East Clare were made. It was, of course, all done in the interest of Irish landlords, who desired to sell. The basis of purchase must be the existing rents, and these men who knew nothing about the value of land in a particular county were sent down in order to make these valuations so that the landlord might get as much money as possible, and in order to prevent the tenants going into Court, and so drive them into purchase. The Land Commissioners issued periodically a list of prices current in the Dublin markets for beef and mutton and for all classes of store stock at the various country fairs. They had inspectors attending at these fairs who sent up a return of the prices of all things sold, and what yearlings and two-year olds and so on were to be bought for, and these returns were sent to the Sub-Commissioners as a guide to them in fixing rents. Some of these Sub-Commissioners were broken-down landlords, while others were men who had endeavoured to farm on their own land and then could not make it pay. He would like to know the names of some of these Sub-Commissioners.

Late in the previous session he put several questions to the right hon. Member for Dover as to whether the Estates Commissioners had any power of initiative with regard to the reinstatement of evicted tenants, or whether the Estates Commissioners had the power of initiative to approach a grabber and suggest to him to take either monetary compensation or a similar farm elsewhere to that which he was in. To these questions he never obtained a satisfactory answer. On June 29th, 1903, during the Report stage of the Land Bill, the hon. and learned Member for Waterford asked whether, under Clause 11 of the Bill, the Estates Commissioners would have power to buy out the interests of existing tenants in order to reinstate evicted tenants, and whether the money at the disposal of the Estates Commissioners, under that clause, would be available for the purpose of restocking and rebuilding farms. The Chief Secretary in reply said—

> "The answer to those two questions is certainly in the affirmative."

In the face of that reply he could not understand how the right hon. Gentleman at the close of the session could have refused to give a definite answer. If nobody had a power of initiative there could not possibly be a settlement where persons had taken possession of evicted tenants' holdings. These grabbers had been described as the landlords' "wounded soldiers." There never was a greater misnomer; while the battle was going on they never took part in the fighting. They were rather the camp followers and jackals, who came in after the battle was over to rifle the wounded and the dead. In nine cases out of ten they were not and never had been practical farmers. Yet, in spite of the definite statement of the late Chief Secretary, the Estates Commissioners, under some occult influence, now refused to approach any grabber. Why was it? Who had given them their instructions? Instructions, regulations, orders, or minutes had been supplied by someone, and somewhere; it was not known by whom, or where. Was it because of those instructions that the Estates Commissioners refused to do that which the Chief Secretary definitely stated they would have power to do? The Attorney-General had stated that he did not give the instructions. But did they issue from the law department of Dublin Castle? Were they given by the Lord-Lieutenant? It was not supposed that the Lord-Lieutenant had anything to do with them. Lord Dudley desired to see the evicted tenants' question settled on just and amicable lines, and for that reason Nationalists were delighted that he still remained at Dublin Castle. Those who had not the courage of their convictions, who could not keep their word, had left the castle, but the man of honour and the man of his word remained.

MR. ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 198. (Division List No. 35.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. SirH
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Berjamin
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A. (Worc.
Chapman, Enward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar, Sir T.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson, Rt. HnSirJ(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,SirR.B.(Inv'rn'ss B'ghs.
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin &Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene,SirEW(B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.

Gretton, John
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords., N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
Kenyon,Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col.W
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir J. (Monmouth)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,Hn.H.L.W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John G. (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long,Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Milmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Peel, Hon.Wm. Robt.Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert

Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford
Shaw-Stewart,Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart,Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. SirWilliamH
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry

Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Gremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William

Devlin, Chas.Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptEC(S.Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William

Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt.Hon. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, V. P. (Cavan, W.)
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid,SirR.Threshie (Dumfries)
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomas, JA (Glamorgan,Gow'r
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,SirJT (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Question put accordingly, "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £700, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 299; Noes, 193. (Division List No. 36.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. HnSir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn. A.J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George

Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.JA (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar,SirT.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ (Manc'r.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,SirR.B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs.
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene,Sir EW(B'ry SEdm'nds
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords., N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir J. (Monmouth)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,Hn.H.L.W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John G. (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,SirW.H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, V. P. (Cavan, W.)
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, H. C. (Finsbury, E.)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, D. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tillett, Louis, John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

Committee to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

RATHMINES AND RATHGAR EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT BILL [BY ORDER].

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.), in rising to move the rejection of this Bill, said he had no wish to detain the House for any length of time, but merely to explain shortly the position of himself and the other Members who had similar Motions on the Paper. Rathmines and Rathgar was an urban district situated in that portion of the county of Dublin which he had the honour to represent. Six Members representing the city and the county of Dublin were returned to this House, and so representative was this Bill that the only persons who could be found to introduce it were the hon. Member for South Londonderry and the hon. Member for North Antrim. That curious state of things did not arise from the fact that those who represented Dublin had failed in their duties to their constituents, but from the fact that they would not be parties to a Bill which proposed to confer on one set of people powers and privileges to the detriment of another set of persons who already enjoyed certain of those powers and privileges. His main reason for asking for the rejection of this Bill was that it transgressed certain rules which had been laid down by the House for its own guidance. The object of the Bill which was proposed by the Urban District Council of Rathmines was to grab a portion of the existing county of Dublin. The portion it proposed to take had a district council of its own and formed the residential portion of the county of Dublin. It was over one-third the size of the existing area of the district which proposed to annex it, and had a local authority of its own. He submitted that it was against the settled principle of the House to allow the annexation of one district by an adjoining district when there was in the district proposed to be annexed a council of its own which was hostile to that annexation, unless there was an overwhelming case made out in favour of it. The Urban District Council of Rathmines was the last body which should have come to this House and ask them to vary their own rule. The Rathmines District Council had been before the House many times, it had given evidence before Committees which was found to be absolutely misleading, and produced figures which, had it been a limited company whose figures were scrutinised every year by an auditor, no auditor would have granted a certificate for. The town clerk of Rathmines before one of the Committees of the House deliberately stated that the rates in existence in the township of Rathmines were only 4s. in the £. He stated the same thing before a Committee of the Upper House. His statement at the time was strictly true, but he omitted to mention that the rates had been deliberately kept down for the purposes of that evidence, and a less rate had been struck than should have been; that in 1898 the rate was struck at 6s. in the £, and that in 1900 it was actually struck at 10s., in order to make up the deficiency which had resulted in 1899 owing to too low a rate having been struck. The indebtedness of the Rathmines Council per head of the population was greater than that of the City of London. They had indulged in the most extravagant and costly schemes which had not the real sanction of the people in the district, and the real fact of the matter was that the Urban District Council of Rathmines had by mismanagement in the past got themselves into such a state of confusion and debt that they had been obliged to look round for some means of extricating themselves, and the only means which they had been enabled to discover was this attempt to annex this adjoining district, thus robbing the county council of the rates of that portion of the county in order that they themselves might take them for the purpose of paying off their own debts. He begged to move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

*MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said the hon. Member who had moved the rejection of the Bill had given so clear an explanation of his reason for so doing that it was not necessary to further labour that point. He himself opposed this Bill on the ground that it would inflict a grave injury upon the Corporation of Dublin, of which he was a member, and the Port and Docks Board of Dublin, of which he was also a member. Both those bodies had entered a protest against this Bill. The unfortunate thing about this Bill was that it came before the House of Commons, very few Members of which understood the matter, and that when the division was taken its fate would be decided by a number of gentlemen who would come in and vote either for or against it, but who had not troubled to come and listen to the arguments. He was perfectly satisfied that if this Bill went before a committee of the citizens of Dublin, no matter whether they were a Unionist or a Nationalist committee, it would be scouted. No case had been made out for the annexation of the district which it was proposed to take over by this Bill. On the other hand, the Corporation of Dublin believed that this Bill would seriously interfere with their scheme of water supply and their great drainage scheme, which had now almost come to completion. The Corporation of Dublin was already supplying the population of the district with water, and, if this Bill was allowed to go through the Rathmines District Council would immediately come into active competition with the Corporation in regard to that. He thought a more preposterous proposal than this could hardly be brought before the House. At the present time the Dublin Port and Docks Board were in negotiation with these people to deal with their sewage. The Port and Docks Board now received £200 a year for allowing them to discharge their sewage into the River Dodder, which was a tributary to the Liffey, and they were now to receive a further £40 a year from the Rathmines people for dealing more effectively with it, as the Rathmines people could not deal with it themselves. The Port and Docks Board of Dublin, therefore, strongly opposed this Bill. Having regard to the great drainage scheme of the city of Dublin and the purification of the Liffey, in which they were now engaged, was it fair, he asked, to the Corporation of Dublin, who had made ample provision to take over the drainage of these surrounding areas, that this council should be set up against them, and that the work they were now doing in regard to the purification of the river should be prevented by another authority coming in and discharging their sewage into the River Dodder through which it passed into the Liffey, and flowed through Dublin, while they themselves were not allowed to discharge into the Liffey, but to carry it out to sea. No case had been made out for this measure. It was an omnibus Bill which went into various other matters, and it would do a serious injury to the Corporation of Dublin. The promoters of this Bill had sent out a dishonest circular in which, on the one hand, they asked for power to carry out the principle of municipalisation, while at the same time they were sending out a circular on behalf of the manufacturers. This Bill would injure the City of Dublin in regard to their main drainage scheme, which it would hamper unfairly; it would increase the City of Dublin's obligation to the county council, increase taxation in the county at large, and impose a heavier burden of taxation upon the districts to be taken in. For these reasons he asked the House to reject the Bill. When the corporation asked for a *locus standi* in regard to this measure they were refused unless they consented to withdraw their opposition. Of course, the Corporation of Dublin could not do such a thing, and so they were refused *locus standi*.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Mooney.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. GORDON (Londonderry, S.) said he knew something about the facts of this case. In regard to this measure hon. Members opposite had dealt with everything but the merits of the Bill. Those who had backed this measure with their names were residents and ratepayers in Dublin, and they were deeply interested in the welfare of the city, and each of them could throw a stone from where they lived into the township of Rathmines. Although they represented other constituencies in the House they were far more interested in the districts affected by this Bill than some of the hon. Members opposite who were opposing it. It had been argued that it was contrary to the settled practice and principle of that House for a large municipal community to annex another without the full consent of that community. Now what had happened in the case of the City of Dublin itself? Three times Dublin had brought Rathmines before the House of Commons to annex them against the wishes of nine-tenths of the people of Rathmines and Pembroke, but they had managed to escape the net of that political caucus which ruled Dublin. Clontarf and Kilmainham fought, but both of them were absorbed. For several sessions Dublin had attempted to bring in Rathmines, which was well managed and well regulated, and in every way well-governed in its non-political affairs. ["Oh, oh!"] Rathmines was Unionist to the backbone. [NATIONALIST laughter.] That was a fact, and it was quite capable of managing its own municipal affairs. It was solely because Rathmines excluded politics from its local affairs, and would not be governed by the Dublin Corporation, that this measure was being opposed by hon. Members opposite.

It had been said that this was a question of the rates. He did not believe that the rates affected the question much, but he would deal with that argument. The rates in Rathmines were 8s. 9d. in the pound, and 3s. 6d. of that went to the county council, and 1s. to pay the costs which the township of Rathmines was forced to incur in defeating the efforts of the Dublin Corporation to annex them. That was the sort of neighbour Rathmines had got. Now the rates in the City of Dublin were 10s. 4d. in the pound, but Rathmines had to pay 7d. or 8d. in the pound as an equalisation rate, and hand it over to the City of Dublin. Rathmines had been called upon to pay an extra rate of 1s. in the pound for five years by an indefensible procedure on the part of the Corporation of Dublin to annex them, the rates in Dublin being 10s. 4d. in the pound.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): Your are inventing that. [Cries of "Withdraw."]

*MR. SPEAKER: That is not a proper expression to use, and I hope the hon. Member will withdraw it.

MR. CLANCY said he did not wish to use an un-Parliamentary expression and he would withdraw it.

MR. GORDON, proceeding, said that Rathmines had a good water supply and the City of Dublin at one time had to go to them when they ran short. The hon. Member for Dublin Harbour had said that the difficulties Dublin was likely to be in for water would probably be mitigated by this Bill if passed.

MR. T. HARRINGTON (Dublin Harbour): The hon. Member is grossly misrepresenting me. What I said was that Dublin Corporation were making calculations for a new reservoir, and I told them that in my judgment the supply was insufficient, and that if this Bill passed there would be a less demand.

MR. GORDON: That is practically what I said. Proceeding, he said that in the first place Dublin would not give them a supply unless they came with their hats in their hands, which they refused to do; but they now had a supply capable of supplying a town three times its size. Rathmines, which lay to the south of Dublin, had been in existence since 1847, and it consisted of some 7,000 or 8,000 inhabitants, who found themselves excluded from everything a populous community required. They got themselves formed into a township, and since then adjoining communities had grown up and got themselves added, till now the township numbered about 35,000, with a valuation, he was told, of over £160,000. Pembroke, a large district beside it, was formed into a township, and in 1877 the two joined, and, under Act of Parliament, carried out a joint drainage scheme, whilst Dublin was still polluting the river and making it a perfect scandal. This particular district, which did not join the city, but was in the county of Dublin, grew up till now it had about 5,000 inhabitants and 1,000 occupied houses, with not one single attempt at drainage and without anything in the nature of any system which should serve a populous community. They applied first to the guardians, who prior to the Act of 1898 were the sanitary authority, and then to the district council to do something for them, but not one single step had been taken to do anything, and ultimately, in self-defence,—and he could not blame them—somebody made an opening in the Rathmines and Rathgar main drainage which was absolutely independent of the Corporation of Dublin, and was constructed at a cost of £100,000. The Rathgar Main Drainage Board then applied for and obtained an injunction, but so convinced were they of the necessity of some drainage for the district that from that day, some five years ago, to this they had never put their injunction in force. Everybody knew that it would inflict such a gross injustice and hardship upon the people of the district that they did not attempt to stop it. It would be a source of danger for them to be left in their undrained state; and therefore what they asked was that the injunction should be dissolved, or that, notwithstanding it, the Bill should be allowed to pass, and the little field, consisting of about 500 acres, should be annexed to Rathmines.

They got some supply of water from Dublin, and there was an arrangement that they should pay for the pipes, but the corporation found out afterwards that this would not work, and they allowed it to be worked out by giving a reduction in the price for a considerable time. There ought, however, to be some regularity as to streets, for at present anyone could put up buildings at their own will and pleasure, and there were a great many matters both as to frontage lines, material, and mode of construction requiring attention. Then there was no means of lighting the place. The hon. Member submitted that inhabitants representing five-sixths of the valuation of the place were in favour of its being taken over. Rathmines wanted to protect itself, to protect the people who lived in this little district, to take them over and form them into part of a good, well-managed, and well cared-for township. The drainage of the Liffey had already cost about £350,000, and would probably cost in the end over £500,000. If the House was satisfied that there was matter here which did not affect the principle, which hon. Members were not now in a position to determine, and which could be examined into by a Committee, with the view to justice being done to all parties, he would respectfully ask that the Bill should be read a second time and sent to a Committee. If the Corporation of Dublin had all the grievances which were suggested, they would be able to bring them before the Committee if they could prove a *locus.* All that the promoters asked, and this showed the strength of their position, was that the Bill should go to a Committee, and that it should not be stopped now.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said this was a matter of certain importance, and he thought it right that he should, on behalf of the Government, express their view on the position. He did not at all express any opinion one way or the other on the merits or the demerits of the scheme put forward by the promoters of the Bill. The question was what was right and proper to be done in the circumstances. There was no assertion that had been made on the opposite side of the House which had not been traversed on his side, and there was no assertion made on his side which had not been traversed on the opposite side, and the result was that the House was absolutely incapable of coming to a conclusion in the matter. In that state of matters what would be the natural course to take? [NATIONALIST cries of "Home Rule."] If Home Rule were in operation, there would not be two disagreeing parties, but there would probably be five. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: You have five in the Tory Party already.] Was it not common-sense and reason that, inasmuch as the House was absolutely unable to decide between the conflicting claims and objections on different sides, the Bill should go to the recognised tribunal where things could be investigated. The hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill praised the local body in whose administrative jurisdiction this unfortunate district was placed. He said that the District Council of Terenure was one of the best governing bodies if they left out the question of lighting, sewers, and water.

MR. MOONEY: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. ATKINSON said he understood the hon. Gentleman to say so, but if he did not say it he might have said it. The local body had not supplied this district with light, sewers, or water. In order to get rid of its sewage it had to poach on its neighbour and deliver sewage against the law into the drains in another county. It was absurd to ask the House to decide between the parties, and, therefore, the only intervention he made on behalf of the Government was to say that in the present state of controversy this was a matter which should go to a tribunal which would be able to investigate the circumstances as they affected the Corporation of Dublin and the local body.

MR. T. HARRINGTON said if the speech which the right hon. Gentleman had just delivered was a specimen of the rigid impartiality of mind which the Government had on this question he and his friends looked with considerable anxiety to the time when he should speak as a partisan. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken on this question as if the Government had really no responsibility. A Joint Committee of the House of Commons and the House of Lords considered the question of the relations between Rathmines, Pembroke, and the City of Dublin some years ago, and the right hon. Gentleman, who occupied the same position then as now, had forgotten that that Joint Committee made a recommendation throwing on the Government the responsibility of establishing a joint board so as to prevent the Liffey from being polluted by the discharge of crude sewage into it. The hon. Member for South Londonderry had assured the House that he had no interest in the district in question or in Rathmines.

MR. GORDON: I have no property there.

MR. T. HARRINGTON said the hon. and learned Member did not explain to the House his reason for his warm advocacy of the Bill. The county council was opposing the Bill, and the district council which had charge of this particular district was also opposing it. Every local authority which had anything to do with the drainage of the district was opposing the Bill, except Rathmines, which proposed to take it in. How were they taking it in? Instead of coming to the House with a Bill for that special purpose, they came with an omnibus Bill, in which this was one of the proposals, and this was done deliberately so as to enable them to make out a case for having the Bill sent to a Committee. If it were simply an attempt to extend boundaries the House could consider the question whether or not there should be an extension. This, he maintained, was a dishonest way of bringing a Bill before the House of Commons. It was not a straight way of facing the question of the acquisition of this district.

The opposition of the Corporation of Dublin to the Bill was two-fold. First of all they said they were the water authority for the district proposed to be added. Since 1872 the corporation had had a contract with the district for the supply of water, and the contract was so favourable to the district that the corporation was bound to supply water at the price at which it was supplied to the city itself. He was not sure but that the corporation could bring an action for an injunction against the Rathmines Commissioners for employing the borough funds in the promotion of a water scheme where a water scheme already existed, for the Commissioners were prohibited from employing the borough funds in competing with the water authority of the district. These Commissioners were using the borough funds in this matter, although they were as favourably situated as regards water as they possibly could be. The water pipes in the district were the property of Dublin Corporation, and the corporation paid rates to the district council in respect of the pipes. As to the question of sewage, the hon. and learned Member opposite pointed out to the House that an injunction was obtained against the people of the district to prevent them from draining into the Rathmines sewers, but he forgot to tell the House what was the case made in favour of the injunction, namely, that the Rathmines drains were not sufficient to take any more sewage. That was the ground on which the injunction was obtained, and now because they were prepared to annex the district the Commissioners were willing to put themselves to inconvenience in order to collar the rates of the district. Now they were going to turn the storm water in one direction and the sewage in another, and take in the district. Up to the present time the River Liffey had been an open sewer, but the Corporation were now expending £500,000 in preventing the pollution of the river, but at the time when this was being done the Rathmines and Rathgar authority and the Pembroke district had a system of drainage which was delivering into the river crude sewage. In 1900 a Committee of the House of Lords reported that they did not see their way to add the two districts of Pembroke and Rathmines to the City of Dublin, but they came to the unanimous conclusion that it would be a public advantage to have one administrative control of the drainage and the treatment of sewage for Dublin and the two townships. The Committee recommended that legislative steps should be taken to constitute a joint district board for the City and Rathmines and Pembroke. When the Bill was reported to the House, Lord Shuttleworth expressed the hope that the Government would consider that recommendation. The Government had not dealt with the question, and the corporation had only delayed until their system of main drainage should be completed in order that they might promote a Bill. That system would not be completed until next June, when they hoped that the whole scheme of the City of Dublin would be in order. Then it was the intention of the corporation to promote a Bill for the establishment of the joint board suggested by the Committee. He hoped the House would give the corporation fair play by rejecting this Bill.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.) said that it was perfectly plain that the real opposition to the Bill came from the Corporation of Dublin; and that

there was very considerable doubt as to whether that corporation had a *locus*. An offer was made to he Dublin Corporation that if they withdrew their opposition to the Second Reading the opposition to their having a *locus* would be withdrawn.

MR. T. HARRINGTON said that that statement was calculated to deceive the House. There were five or six other parties opposing the Second Reading.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said he apologised if he had been led into a mistake. He believed that it was the wish of the House that if this Bill or any other Bill had merits it should be allowed to pass. Hon. Gentlemen opposite desired to prevent the House from ever getting to a discussion on the merits, but no real reason had been shown why the Second Reading should not be passed and the Bill sent upstairs for consideration and adjustment on its merits in Committee. The opposition, he contended, had been determined mainly by political motives, and he hoped that the House would defeat this attempt to deprive the people of Rathmines and Rathgar of the opportunity of presenting the merits of the case before the Committee upstairs.

*__MR. T. W. RUSSELL__ (Tyrone, S.) said he had been asked by the Rathmines Town Commissioners to support the Bill, and by the Dublin Corporation to oppose it. He had declined to put his name on the back of the Bill, or to say what he would do before he had heard the debate. Nobody would be able to say that he had been retained either by the Dublin Corporation or by Rathmines. Two years ago he had given his strongest support to the annexation of Rathmines by Dublin, and it would have been done but for political feeling on both sides. After listening to the debate that evening, and with no prejudice in favour of Rathmines, but rather the contrary, he would not undertake the responsibility of doing anything to prevent the Bill going upstairs to a Committee.

Question put.

The House divided—Ayes, 207; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 37.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allen, Charles P.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt Hon. Sir H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cawley, Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Channing, Francis Allston
Chapman, Edward
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Rt Hon. Sir John C. R
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fellowes, Hon Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, Williams Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick S. W.
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Hain, Edward
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Staffords, N W
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon Arthur Fred
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W
Kerr, John
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, J. Grant, (Yorks, N.R
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr.
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, W.J H (Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tennant, Harold John
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley, (York E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks.)

Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. John Gordon and Mr. Moore.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Burke, E. Haviland
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrington, Timothy
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Johnson, John
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, Thomas (W Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. B. E (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N Dorset
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Mooney and Mr. Nannetti.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

CLASS III.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £12,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending March 31st, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Departments of the Solicitor for the Affairs of His Majesty's Treasury, King's Proctor, and Director of Public Prosecutions, the Cost of Prosecutions, and other Legal Proceedings."

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax), said that the first item of this Vote, BB., was £3,500 which it was stated, in a note on the Paper, was a sum for the repayment of the expenses of the prosecution of Whitaker Wright, in addition to £2,000 already voted, making in all a total of £5,500 required for that purpose. He did not know what arrangement had been made by the Government with the gentleman who undertook the prosecution, but what he did remember was that the Attorney-General was frequently pressed in the House to undertake that prosecution and that the hon. and learned Gentleman stated that, in his opinion, it was not a case likely to prove successful. Therefore it had been left to private individuals, on their own initiative, to bring the case into the Courts of justice. When it was remembered that the Attorney-General received a salary of £7,000, and in addition fees to the amount of £12,921, he thought it was a pity that they should be called upon to pay £5,500 for legal proceedings which ought to have been undertaken by the law officers of the Crown. In order to make a protest against the way in which this matter had been mismanaged he moved to reduce the item by £1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item BB (Criminal Prosecutions not undertaken by the Director of Public Prosecutions) be reduced by £1,000."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): said it was rather more than a year since he had the opportunity, in the debate on the Address, of stating very fully the grounds on which he came to the conclusion, after taking the best advice and after full consideration of all the circumstances, that this prosecution should not be undertaken by the Director of Public Prosecutions. The hon. Gentleman had said it might be a question whether these costs should be paid in view of the fact that the Director of Public Prosecutions ought to have undertaken the prosecution. Might he point out that a large part of these costs would have been incurred even if the Director of Public Prosecutions had undertaken the prosecution? The only difference would have been that the fees for counsel, instead of going into the pockets of the gentlemen who did conduct the prosecution, would have gone into the pockets of those very much underpaid officials, the law officers of the Crown. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh!"] Under these circumstances, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not object to the Vote after the order made by the Judge, so that the costs of the prosecution, which would be fully taxed, should not fall on the shoulders of private individuals.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said that the Committee were thoroughly dissatisfied with this wretched business; and he hoped his hon. friend would take a division. As to the Attorney-General being underpaid, many eminent lawyers would be glad to do the work for less.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said he thought a public apology was due from the Attorney-General, and also that other legal luminary, the Solicitor-General.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) said he had nothing to apologise for.

MR. FLYNN said although the Solicitor-General might not apologise, he would have heard a great deal more of the case if Gentlemen above the gangway had discharged the duty of criticising the Government which primarily devolved on them. It was all very well for officials to talk in a tone of levity with regard to their fees; but their enormous salaries were no laughing matter for the taxpayers. It was a public scandal that the right hon. Gentleman had no explanation to offer the Committee for an obvious failure in his official duties. But for the public spirit of private individuals this infamous scandal would not have been exposed. This prince of swindlers blasted the career of one of the most brilliant Irishmen of his generation, whose latter days were shaded and darkened by the misery brought upon him. Yet, apparently, the legal luminaries on the Treasury bench were unable to prosecute him; and he hoped that a division would be taken as a protest against the manner in which they discharged their duties. In times like the present, with a shilling income-tax and extra duties on tea and sugar, it was no light matter to be paying enormous salaries to the law officers. He charged Gentlemen above the gangway, with a few honourable exceptions, with an absolute abandonment of their duty as critics of the Government, which they said should be turned out.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said that the Attorney-General stated that he decided not to prosecute Whitaker Wright after taking the best advice he possibly could. To whom did the right hon. Gentleman apply for advice?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the responsibility for every decision rested with him alone; but he had the opportunity of consulting with and discussing these matters with the Director of Public Prosecutions, the experienced gentlemen who acted for the Treasury, and, above all, the Solicitor-General.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said that the Solicitor-General stated in the House that it would be impossible, in his opinion, to prosecute Whitaker Wright successfully.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said what he stated was that in his opinion the evidence did not bring Whitaker Wright within the statute.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the expression of the right hon. Gentleman was that under the existing law it would be impossible to prosecute Whitaker Wright. That duty then involved on private individuals, and he desired to know whether they would be recompensed for performing a duty which ought to have been performed by the law officers, or whether these men would be ruined.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the costs of the prosecution would be taxed and would then be paid out of the money voted by the House.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said it was important to know who would pay the costs beyond the taxed costs, which would probably be very considerable. The Attorney-General stated that he had consulted the Public Prosecutor. Was not the reason why the Public Prosecutor was so very slow in advising prosecutions owing to the fact that he was treated almost as a criminal by the Treasury if he did not obtain a verdict?

SIR EDWARD CARSON: We are all treated as criminals. I do not mind in the least.

MR. LABOUCHERE said any man would be criminal on £20,000 a year. He would suggest that the Treasury should not take the line to which he referred. They could never be sure of a verdict; he knew that from his own experience, and had suffered for it. The Treasury should accept the fact that they might lose; and if they did, they should not complain about it. In regard to companies, it was very essential in the public interest that the law officers should prosecute when they thought there was a fair case. In most companies many of the shareholders were poor, and would not incur the risk of a prosecution. That was the reason why the Treasury should prosecute, and not object when they did not get a verdict. A few years ago there was a change in the manner in which the law officers were paid. They were then told that the new method would be cheaper. He would ask the Attorney-General whether, taking year in and year out, that had been the case.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That does not arise on this Vote.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.) said he would not have intervened in the discussion were it not for the high-handed manner in which the Solicitor-General had treated the Committee. He had nothing but praise and admiration for the manner in which the Committee had been treated by the Attorney-General; and for his support of an Estimate for an amount of money which was rightly to be refunded to those who, at the risk of the remnant of their property, determined to see justice done. He was present in Court when the application was made by the hon. and learned Member for Reading and when Mr. Justice Buckley gave his decision. Previous to that learned decision of that very learned Judge he had read with amazement, because he had some knowledge of similar proceedings in another remarkable case, the statement of the Solicitor-General. He read that statement in the light of his knowledge of the Larceny Act, under which the prosecution was eventually brought; and he thought, in his humble judgment, that the conclusion of the right hon. Gentleman was not correct. When he listened to the decision of Mr. Justice Buckley, with all the respect due to any utterance from such a learned source, he could not help thinking that the judgment was given with a view of letting down the law officers of the Crown as lightly as possible, while at the same time it maintained the public rights that were at stake and which ought to have been asserted by the law officers. To oppose the Vote would be an illogical proceeding; but he thought that the Committee was entitled, if not to an apology from the Solicitor-General, at least to an explanation. The right hon. Gentleman ought to demean himself respectfully to the Committee. Other men as good as he had made mistakes in their professional career; they were all prone to make mistakes; and he did not think it would detract from the dignity of the right hon. Gentleman's position, which he so worthily and brilliantly filled, if he made an explanation in respect of this prosecution.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said if he interpreted the view of the Committee accurately it was their desire, if possible, to bury this unfortunate and wretched business. So far as Whitaker Wright was personally concerned, he had paid the penalty with his life; and he thought the matter might be allowed to rest as far as he was concerned. A very important point was, however, raised by this proposal. He thought the Committee were unanimous in their sympathy with those who instituted the proceedings; but the point which he wished to bring before the Committee was the importance of the precedent they were setting if they passed this Vote. Was it to be the case in future that any private individual could institute a prosecution and rely on the Treasury to pay his expenses if he were successful? That was really the point raised by the Vote. He wished to know what there was in the Whitaker Wright prosecution that induced the Treasury to pay the expenses of the private prosecutors. There were, in his opinion, only two explanations. The first and obvious one was that the Treasury admitted that the law officers had made a mistake in not undertaking responsibility for the prosecution. So far as he was concerned, he did not profess to be able to judge whether the law officers were right in their action or not. He did not know what evidence they had before them; but he did not think that anyone would suggest that they were actuated by any private considerations. He had no doubt that their decision was arrived at dispassionately. The important point, however, was why the Treasury sanctioned this Vote. Surely it was not because the prosecution was successful. Had it failed, would there have been a Vote before the Committee for the expenses? He ventured to say that the Committee would have laughed at any such proposal, and that the law officers or the Treasury would never have consented to pay the expenses of a private prosecution had it been unsuccessful. Therefore, the Committee ought to be given some explanation. The obvious interpretation was that the law officers admitted that they had made a mistake. Otherwise, it was a Vote given entirely because of sympathy with the public feeling which was created by the unfortunate crash caused by the Whitaker Wright collapse. He did not object to the money being given to these private prosecutors; but they would be establishing a precedent which would have a far-reaching effect. How were they going to distinguish between cases of this kind? In future, according to this precedent, it would be open to form a private prosecution committee, and to prosecute any person, and if the prosecution were successful they would have a claim on the Treasury. If that were not the case, why was this particular instance singled out from all similar prosecutions.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.) said that he had no desire to rake up the evil memories associated with Whitaker Wright; but during his short experience in the House he had never listened to a more cavalier answer given by a Minister than that which they had heard from the Solicitor-General. He told the House he would not apologise for what everyone admitted was a gross dereliction of duty.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: If I had been guilty of any dereliction of duty, I most certainly should not only have apologised, but should not have continued to hold my office. I exercised my judgment honestly according to the best of my ability, and that is all any law officer can do.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN said the right hon. Gentleman was the only Minister who had sat on the Treasury Bench who would resign for a dereliction of duty. He was delighted that one of his own countrymen was the first to recognise the position. The right hon. Gentleman was not only a law officer of the Crown; he had been the chief apostle in the campaign of slander against Sir Antony MacDonnell, and in fomenting opposition to one of his own colleagues in the Cabinet.

*The CHAIRMAN: This is not in order.

Mr. Dalziel.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN said he only gave it as a reason why the right hon. Gentleman had not time to examine into the Whitaker Wright case. He accepted the ruling of the Chair, and recognised that even if that were the reason, he had no right to discuss it. As one of his hon. friends pointed out, the law officers were placed in a position to enable them to give all their time to the legal business of the Government, and apply their master minds to cases which concerned millions of money belonging to the people of this country. Here was a case where millions of money were swindled away, but the right hon. Gentleman airily passed the case aside until a Judge on the bench had to tell him what his duty was. Some philanthropists on that side of the House stated that the Vote should pass because private individuals should not be put to the expense of this prosecution. The law officers had, however, salaries amounting to £32,100; they must admit that they had made a mistake; and he would suggest to them that they should pay the costs out of their salaries, and, in that way, relieve the public from expenditure entirely incurred through their ignorance. He was inclined at first to think that it was a sense of chivalry of a high constitutional lawyer that inspired the mind of the Solicitor-General. Then he remembered that the right hon. Gentleman was a coercion prosecutor in Ireland, and that he prosecuted Members of Parliament and sent them to prison. He could not, therefore, understand why the right hon. Gentleman had displayed so much squeamishness in connection with the Whitaker Wright prosecution. He did not suppose, however, that his suggestion would be accepted, especially in view of the fact that the salaries were not likely to last long.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) said the Treasury had already paid a sum, though perhaps not a very large sum, in addition to the taxed costs to the persons responsible for the prosecution. As to the reasons why the prosecution was not undertaken by the Attorney-General, the matter had been fully dealt with on a previous occasion, and he had nothing to add to what was then said.

MR. DALZIEL said that possibly the hon. Gentleman did not hear the point he raised. What he wanted was an answer to the question what were the considerations which induced the Treasury to depart in this case from their well-established rule that they should not pay the costs in a private prosecution. Was it because the Treasury were convinced that a mistake had been made by the law officers? Or was it because of the public interest which had been created? If it was for neither of those reasons, was it because the Treasury had so much money at their disposal that they thought they might pay these costs out of their own funds? This was a Treasury matter, and he thought the Committee were entitled to a full explanation from the representative of the Treasury, who doubtless had the whole of the facts at his finger ends.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said his learned friend the Attorney-General had already fully stated the reasons why he had advised the Treasury to pay the costs, and it was on that advice that the Treasury had acted.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the Committee would recollect that this case was the subject of a great deal of consideration in February of last year. The precise point which he had to determine was whether the prosecution should be undertaken in the name of the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Solicitor-General was in no sense responsible for the decision which had been come to on that point. The responsibility rested with him, and with him alone. But it seemed to be the general desire of the House, when the matter was under discussion a year ago, that the costs of this private prosecution should be borne by the Treasury, and therefore the Treasury, with his full concurrence, decided to pay the costs. In these circumstances he submitted it would be a little hard were the Committee now to go back upon their decision.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said there must be a great many other cases similar to this though they were not so well known. They wished to know on what particular ground this case was differentiated from other similar cases. There must be some rule or definite principle laid down to justify a departure from well-established precedent, and his hon. friend desired to know what that rule or principle was.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) said he was one of those who, when this matter of Whitaker Wright's prosecution was first under discussion, ventured to differ from the opinion expressed by the Attorney and Solicitor-General. There was no question whatever of any dereliction of duty, but he thought the law officers attached too much importance to one principle in their examination of the case, and in their view of the duty of the Public Prosecutor—and that was that there should be, as he understood them to say, some certainty of conviction. He very much questioned that as a principle in the administration of the criminal law at all; in a criminal prosecution the objective ought not to be victory, but truth. The first step in such proceedings would be a magisterial investigation, and if it was then found that an ultimate conviction was improbable there might not be a committal for trial, or the proceedings need not be continued. The fear of a public investigation was a deterrent influence, and one chief object of the appointment of the Public Prosecutor. In this case such an investigation was, in any event, as he had said at the time, fortifying his opinion by references to the statutes under which Wright was ultimately convicted, absolutely necessary, and he was glad the result had been to assert the rights and vindicate the wrongs of many people who had been greatly injured. He thought the law officers had given very proper advice in suggesting the payment of full costs to those who had undertaken the risk and responsibility of instituting the prosecution, with the authority of the learned Judge who authorised it, by which means justice was done and the law vindicated.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) congratulated the hon. Member for South Islington on having proved himself a better and greater lawyer than either of the law officers of the Crown. In this matter the House of Commons had not been treated fairly or even respectfully. In 1903 an Amendment to the Address was moved by the hon. Member for South Molton calling attention to this case, and the Government escaped defeat by the skin of their teeth only on the solemn pledge of the Prime Minister that he would introduce legislation to remedy the alleged defect in the law. Down to the present time no remedial legislation whatever had been brought forward. As a matter of fact it was unnecessary, as Mr. Whitaker Wright was prosecuted and convicted under the existing law. In both 1903 and 1904 the "guillotine" was so worked as to prevent discussion on the salaries of the law officers, and thus to silence the House of Commons in regard to their action in the matter. In 1904 an Amendment was again put down to the Address, but before it could be moved some of the respectabilities above the gangway on the Opposition side of the House asked a question in reply to which the Attorney-General made an *ex parte* statement on which he could not be cross-examined. Why was there a "put up" Question and Answer to prevent discussion? Seeing that the Prime Minister promised legislation to deal with the matter, he thought the right hon. Gentleman's absence on the present occasion most questionable.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said the House ought to have a plain Answer to the Question upon what grounds the Treasury abandoned their established practice of refusing to pay for a private prosecution. The Attorney-General had referred to a general feeling in the House. A general feeling to do what? Not to pay the costs of a private prosecution, but for the Treasury themselves to prosecute, and that general desire was resisted by the hon. and learned Gentleman. If the Attorney-General blundered, he should say so frankly. The Committee wanted a clear explanation from the representative of the Treasury, and in order to give the Secretary to the Treasury time to consult the Treasury records on the subject he moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he had already answered the Question. The Attorney-General did not think in the first place that the case was one which ought to be prosecuted, but subsequently a very strong feeling was expressed that the Government ought to have taken up the prosecution, and the Treasury thought they were only doing what was fair and proper in the circumstances in paying the costs of the prosecution. There was nothing behind the decision.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) expressed his surprise that the Motion to report Progress had not been accepted by the Government. Very strong feeling had been aroused in the country over the failure of the Government to prosecute, and the matter could not be fully discussed in the short time which had been allotted to it.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH (interposing) said he would have no objection to agree to the Motion, but he hoped the Treasury would be allowed to take the Vote without prolonged discussion on a subsequent occasion.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said the hon. Gentleman must understand that no condition was made on the Opposition side of the House with regard to the length of the debate.

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

SMALL ARMS DEPARTMENTS (ENFIELD AND SPARKBROOK).

MR. HARRIS (Tynemouth) on behalf of Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.) moved an Address for Return showing—

"(1) The average number of persons employed at the Small Arms Department at Enfield, and the Manufacturing Department at Sparkbrook, respectively, for each of the last ten years, 1895 to 1904, inclusive, showing separately, the number of the administrative and clerical staff and of the artisans and labourers.

"(2) The rate of wages paid to the principal classes of workmen at the two Departments above named, respectively.

"(3) The rates of sick pay, pension allowance, or bonus, at the two Departments, respectively, if they differ in any way.

"(4) The price of coal at the two factories, respectively, giving, if possible, the average price per ton per annum for the same quality for the last five years.

"(5) The number of small arms, whether rifles or pistols, of any kind turned out in each year by the two factories, respectively.

"(6) The amount expended during the years 1902–3 and 1903–4 at Sparkbrook, in the Manufacturing Department, on new buildings machinery, engines, and boilers.

"(7) The same for the Small Arms Department at Enfield.

"(8) The cost of the same class of rifle made during the last ten years at Enfield and Sparkbrook respectively.

"(9) The amount of fixed charges, including rent, rates, and taxes, contributions to or provision for religious worship and secular instruction, depreciation on buildings and machinery, interest on capital, etc., debited to the Small Arms Department at Enfield and to the Manufacturing Department at Sparkbrook, respectively, for each of the last five years."

Several HON. MEMBERS rose to object.

*MR. SPEAKER said it had been ruled frequently that an unopposed Return could not be objected to merely on the ground that it was after midnight.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said they desired some explanation of the Return.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked whether it was not competent for hon. Members to ask for information with regard to a Return such as this, involving as it did public expenditure and work in various departments.

*MR. SPEAKER: When an hon. Member asks for information and the Government consents to give it, it has never been the practice to object. There is no reason why an exception should be made in this case.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) asked why the matter was brought before the House at all if they had no power to object.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked whether Members could not inquire why other particulars were not to be included in the Return.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is perfectly open to hon. Members if they wish for other information to ask for a further Return. Have hon. Members any substantial objection to the Return being granted?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said he objected on the ground of the expense to the public.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Government has undertaken that responsibility. If hon. Gentlemen have any substantial objection to make to it, I will not take it now. But it must be understood that an unopposed Return cannot be objected to simply because it is after twelve o'clock.

The Motion was then postponed.

On the Motion that the House do now adjourn.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) asked the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury whether any hon. Gentleman had yet been appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington): I have no information to give to the House on the subject.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked whether anybody had yet been appointed to the Presidency of the Board of Agriculture. That Department had for some time been without a head, to the great inconvenience of hon. Members interested in questions relating to agriculture.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) reminded the right hon. Baronet that on a previous occasion he declared that no resignation had been tendered on behalf of the late Chief Secretary, whereas only three days later the Prime Minister stated that he had at last yielded to the repeated appeals of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover that he might be allowed to resign his office. The right hon. Baronet gave a very emphatic denial on the occasion in question. He ventured to think that such an answer did not show that regard for the facts which the House desired to see in one holding so responsible a position.

*SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD said he could quite understand the natural impatience of the hon. Member for Oldham at not having yet received a letter from the Prime Minister offering him an office in His Majesty's Government. He strongly repudiated any imputation upon his good faith. He had given the House all the information he possessed. As to the Presidency of the Board of Agriculture, he was not in a position to give any information.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he had no desire to make any imputation upon the good faith of the right hon. Baronet, but he certainly did make an imputation as to the accuracy of his facts.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) called attention to the habitual absence of the Prime Minister from the debates in the House. Disraeli, Gladstone, Smith, and Harcourt, gentlemen who knew what was due to the House of Commons, were always in their places until the rising of the House so as to be able to answer any Questions that might arise. The present Leader of the House, however, whenever he knew a question was to be raised, beat a strategic retreat. That was a pretty position for the Prime Minister to occupy, and he thought it did not show that respect to which the House of Commons was entitled.

Adjourned at sixteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 10th March, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Darien Gold Mining Company Bill [H.L.]. Presented (pursuant to leave given yesterday), and read 1^{a}.

Orphan Working School and Alexandra Orphanage Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a} (according to order), and committed.

Bristol Blind Asylum Bill [H.L.]; University College, London (Transfer) Bill [H.L.]. Reports from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Gamble's Divorce Bill [H.L.]. Witnesses to attend on the hearing of the petition for substituted service, one to produce a document.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SCOTCH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

Code of Regulations for Day Schools, 1905; with appendices.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (CIRCULAR 523).

Circular as to additional grants on account of pupil teachers.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.

Account of Moneys received and paid by the Chamberlain of the city of London for the year 1904, also on account of extraordinary works executed other than general repairs for the same period. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Committee have nominated the following Lords to serve as Chairmen of the Standing Committee:—

E. Spencer.
E. Onslow.
E. Camperdown.
V. Cross.
L. Balfour.
L. Elgin. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
L. Burghclere.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from the Committee of Chairmen of the Standing Committee, That they have appointed the Viscount Cross Chairman of the Standing Committee; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICANTS TO CHILDREN BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

REVACCINATION OF CHILDREN.

The Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether it is their intention to introduce a Bill this session for the promotion of the revaccination of children at school age. I am induced to ask this question because it appears to me that the attitude of His Majesty's Government has undergone some change on this subject, and I think it is extremely desirable that we should know exactly what the Government's intention is with regard to it. It will be in your Lordships' recollection that the Vaccination Bill of 1898 received some rather strong criticism when it was passing through its stages in this House because it did not provide for revaccination. Lord Lister made a very strong protest on that ground, and at that time Lord Harris, who had charge of the Bill, used these words—

> "The noble Lord (Lord Lister) indicated that he had already approached members of the Government and been encouraged to hope that the Government considered the possibility of introducing a Bill next year with the object of encouraging revaccination. If the noble Lord had not indicated that fact I had authority to say so myself. It is, of course, quite impossible to attempt to introduce the principle this year, but the Government are prepared to consider whether it would not be possible to bring in a Bill next year to encourage revaccination, and, under all those circumstances, I trust your Lordships will allow this Bill to proceed."

That was not, I admit, a promise to introduce a Bill the following year, but it was at any rate a promise that the matter would be dealt with by the Government, and not be entirely forgotten. When I had the honour of moving the Second Reading of the Revaccination Bill which I introduced last year, the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said—

> "The Royal Commission thought it undesirable to have resort to compulsory revaccination

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

because they conceived—and I cannot help thinking rightly conceived—that compulsory revaccination would add to the volume of hostility to revaccination which the Government had to encounter in the country. That view has prevailed with His Majesty's Government.

Now, the Royal Commission reported in 1896, and it is not easy to understand how Lord Harris in 1898 said on the authority of the Government that they would consider whether they could not bring in a measure to encourage revaccination, and then last year the Government should fall back on the Report of the Commission which they knew in 1898 said that revaccination, if not undesirable, was inexpedient. The effect of hanging up this question is seen in the figures. From February, 1904, to February, 1905, in 315 urban districts there were 7,704 cases of smallpox, and of this number 7,469 occurred in 169 districts. Of course, those districts where vaccination is unpopular stand very forward in the list. At Dewsbury there were 560 cases; at Gateshead, 375; at Leicester, 262; at Newcastle, 382; and at Oldham, 301. The same may be said of the rural districts. I have the figures here, but will not detain your Lordships with them. That is only one of the evils which ensue from the want of revaccination in this country. It is largely a question of pounds, shillings, and pence. All the counties are being put to great expense in providing isolation hospitals, which would not have been necessary in the majority of instances if vaccination and revaccination had been properly carried out. In Germany, where revaccination is systematically practised, isolation hospitals have almost entirely fallen into disuse. One of the difficulties in the case of these isolation hospitals is that local authorities are obliged to pay very highly for the sites, because the land adjoining is necessarily deteriorated in value. If you put a smallpox hospital on a farm you cannot let that farm as easily as you could before. Not only that, but the whole population rises in arms, for no one wants an isolation hospital near him. All these difficulties and all this expense are caused simply and solely because we have not encouraged revaccination. The noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs spoke last year as if the making of revaccination compulsory would be very unpopular. Allow me to say it is not a question, in one sense at any rate, of making revaccination compulsory. So long as you have the conscientious objector it cannot be said that it is compulsory. What we want the Government to do is what Lord Harris said the Government were prepared to do——

LORD KENYON: Prepared to consider.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: I am much obliged to my noble friend for his correction. I will take his words and ask whether the Government have considered the matter and come to the conclusion that it is impossible to encourage revaccination by any measure that can be introduced.

LORD KENYON: My Lords, the Government are certainly in favour of encouraging revaccination as far as possible, and offered no opposition to the noble Duke's Bill of last year, but they rely on the Report of the Royal Commission of 1896, which stated that compulsory revaccination was not practicable. The Commissioners thought that there were practical difficulties in the way. Possibly these difficulties may have been overcome in Germany, but they did not see their way to overcome them in this country, and they were afraid that compulsion would encourage greater hostility here to revaccination. The Government considered the practicability of bringing in a Bill, and came to the conclusion that it was not possible to do so. The noble Duke quoted figures to show that there had been a considerable amount of smallpox in the country. I should like to say that the figures show a gradual diminution of cases since the Act of 1898, and the Government hope that this diminution may continue until smallpox nas almost died out of the land. But as long as the conscientious objector is allowed to exist—and we do not see how we can get rid of him—it is impossible to introduce a Bill dealing fully and completely with vaccination and revaccination. On behalf of the Government, therefore, my reply must be in the negative.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday 10*th March*, 1905.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next.

NORTH-EAST LONDON RAILWAY BILL (BY ORDER).

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday, 21st March.

NORWICH UNION LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY [STAMP DUTIES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Society certain property, there be charged a Stamp Duty of five pounds, and such Duty shall be impressed upon the copy of the intended Act to be delivered to the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the section of this Act the marginal note whereof is 'Copy of Act to be registered."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Surely there should be some explanation of this. Does it form any precedent?

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): This is a clause which has been inserted in a considerable number of Bills of a similar character, and it meets the convenience of the Inland Revenue and the corporation in question. The Inland Revenue are satisfied that there will be no loss to the revenue arising from this transaction.

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): That, Mr. Deputy-Chairman, may be a perfectly satisfactory explanation, but I think the House should regard with the utmost jealousy this putting down of private business on a Friday.

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: There can be no discussion on a Friday upon this business.

Mr. LOUGH: Then I object.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

PETITIONS.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Arbroath; Brechin; and Forfar; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.

Accounts presented, for the year 1904, with an Account of extraordinary Works executed other than the general Repairs for the same period [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Circular as to Additional Grants on Account of Pupil Teachers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (CODE 1905).

Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Day Schools, 1905, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (MEMORANDUM ON ESTIMATES).

Copy presented, of Memorandum of the Secretary of State relating to the Army Estimates of 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 8, 1905).

Copy presented, of Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway respecting Telegraphic Communication between the two Countries. Signed at Stockholm, 2nd February, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Dublin Police and Carmen.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware of the action of the police authorities in proceeding against the carmen of Dublin using a certain hazard for obstruction; whether the divisional magistrate has suggested means whereby the obstruction would be removed; and whether, seeing that the tramway company and the Carmen's Association have agreed to a plan whereby all cause for complaint has been removed, he will take such steps, under all the circumstances, as will prevent any further police proceedings in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The magistrate adjourned this case for a month in order that a point of law involved might be discussed by counsel. The jurisdiction of the chief commissioner to regulate stands under the 49th Section of the 16 & 17 Vict., cap. 112, has been raised, and it is essential that this point should be determined in the first instance, whatever arrangements may ultimately be practicable.

Royal Fleet Reserve.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the present number of the Royal Fleet Reserve, as compared with that expected in the Estimate explained in 1902; and whether the Government have in view the Report of the Grey Committee that the minimum rather than the total number of Reserve that must be provided would be 50 per cent. of the number of men required to mobilise the Fleet and harbour establishments.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The present number of the Royal Fleet Reserve, Class B, is 5,754, or an increase of 2,865 in about two years, the number borne in November, 1902, having been 2,889. The estimates of Sir Edward Grey's Committee were based on the probable war Fleet of 1906–7, and though only half the period comprised in their calculations has elapsed, the result has shown the general correctness of their expectations as regards the growth of this Reserve. The total number of active service and Reserve ratings provided in the Estimates for 1905–6 will give a margin of more than 50 per cent. after the Fleet and harbour establishments have been mobilised, and the Admiralty consider that the provision is for the present sufficient.

Weighing of Postal Packets.

Colonel WELBY (Taunton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that many poor persons have no private means of weighing printed papers for post; and whether he can say what regulation in the Post Office Guide denies to the public the right of having printed packets weighed as part service for postage paid, while compelling the public to hand in all parcels for parcel post to be weighed.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The regulation on the subject will be found at page 46, paragraph 4, of the Post Office Guide. It may well be the case that many people have no private means of weighing packets for the post, but in practice postmasters almost invariably weigh packets for the public when asked to do so. If the hon. Member has any specific case in view and will be good enough to give me particulars, I will have inquiry made.

Colonel WELBY: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can see his way to establishing a system by which a printed packet weighed at a post office for sending abroad shall be so stamped or marked as to identify the office, and thus save the detention of the packet in the General Post Office until insufficient postage has been collected from the addressee in a foreign country.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) A packet for a place abroad which is entitled to pass as a packet of printed papers is sent forward without delay, even if the postage paid is insufficient. A packet which exceeds the maximum weight for printed papers becomes subject to the rules for parcels, which require payment of the whole postage before despatch. Cases in which the error is caused by a mistake in weighing the packet at a post office are so rare that I do not think it necessary to make special provision for them.

Electrified District Railway—Driver's Assistant.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that in the arrangements by the Metropolitan District Railway for driving the proposed new electric trains, no apparent provision is being made for the driver to be accompanied by an assistant; and that, in case of an accident to the driver, no competent person would be present to take charge of the train; and whether the Board of Trade will bring the question before the directors with a view to ensuring the safety of passengers and officials.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to the reply given to a recent Question by the hon. Member for North-West Durham on this subject. The reply is printed in yesterday's† Votes.

Derailments of Tender-Engines drawing Passenger Trains.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he could state how many cases of derailment of tender-engines running passenger trains have occurred during the twenty years ending 1904; and if he will give a Return of these, showing date, place of accident, and railway, and the conclusions of the Board of Trade inspectors thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I will cause a Return to be prepared of the cases of derailment of tender-engines drawing passenger trains that have occurred during the past twenty years and have formed the subject of inquiry by the railway inspecting officers of the Board of Trade. This Return will include the particulars asked for by my hon. and gallant friend. To give the total number of derailments without particulars would not be useful.

Meat Inspection.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the Board of Agriculture, if his attention has been directed to the absence of uniformity in the various systems of meat inspection now in local operation in England, and whether he would consider the advisability of establishing some system of branding or certificate, such as exists in other countries, by which butchers and other vendors of meat who have purchased their supplies from Smithfield, or some other central market under scientific inspection, may be able to associate with the meat so purchased the certificate which passed the meat as sound and free from disease.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) My attention has been drawn to the alleged absence of uniformity as regards meat inspection by local authorities in England, and I have instructed one of the medical inspectors of my Department to make inquiry on the subject. I will give consideration to the suggestion of my noble friend in connection with the report of the inspector when it is received.

Damage to Roads by Traction Engines.

Mr. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the damage done to roads by the corrugated wheels of traction engines, and the consequent charges on the rates, he can hold out any prospect of legislation forbidding the use of such grooved and corrugated wheels.

---

† See page 907.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) There is an express provision in Section 28 of the Highways and Locomotives (Amendment) Act, 1878, allowing the driving wheels of a locomotive to be shod with diagonal cross bars. Under the Locomotives on Highways Act, 1896, I have varied the requirements of this section so as to allow of the use of wheels which are shod with wooden blocks, and I am now dealing with an application to authorise the use of what is known as the "pedrail," but I am afraid that I could not hold out any prospect of legislation forbidding the use of a form of wheel which is specifically contemplated by the Act of 1878, and which has been employed ever since the passing of that Act.

Protection from Fire—Appointment of Committee.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when he will set up the Committee on Means of Protection from Fire agreed upon last session.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I shall be happy to consult with the hon. Member as to the steps to be taken for this purpose.

Return of Accidents in Mines.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the official Returns of accidents in mines do not include accidents for which compensation is paid by the employers; and whether he will direct for the future that all accidents in mines where the owner has to pay compensation shall be reported to His Majesty's inspectors, and such accidents be duly given in the official Returns.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) Whether or no an accident must be reported depends on the extent and nature of the injury sustained, and not on the payment of compensation. I have no power under the Mines Acts to direct that accidents in respect of which compensation is paid shall be separately reported by the owners, but I am proposing in the Accidents (Mines and Factories) Bill, which is now before the House, to provide for a yearly Return being made by mineowners of all accidents which disable for a period of more that a fortnight. This Return will show approximately the number of accidents in which compensation is payable under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Revenue Officials and Estate Duty.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the officials of the Estate Duty Office have any authority to add to, alter, or expand the terms, or any statutory definition of the terms, of a taxing statute, or to construe such a statute otherwise than in strict accordance with the language used; whether he will explain why, in a recent case to which his attention has been called, these officials, for the purpose of levying additional succession duty, claimed the right to give to Section 21 (1) of 51 Vic., c. 8, a meaning of their own, by substituting for a definition in that section part of the description of a different subject-matter; and will he state why they refused to inform the taxpayer concerned what there was in the language of the section as it stood that justified their demand for this additional succession duty, or authorised such a method of interpretation; and whether he has sanctioned the action of these revenue officials.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It is the duty of the Estate Duty Office, as of every Government Department, to administer the law as laid down in the statutes, and as interpreted by the Courts in those cases in which the language of a statute admits of doubt. In the particular case to which the hon. Member refers, I have already informed the gentleman concerned in it that I must decline to review the decision of the Department, and that I have satisfied myself that proper care and attention have been given to the case. If the gentleman is not satisfied, he should make his appeal to the Courts in the proper way. The Inland Revenue Board will be prepared to defend their action.

Manual Instructresses qualified as Assistant Mistresses in Irish Schools.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he can state what is the number of manual instructresses employed in Irish national schools who are qualified to act as assistant mistresses; and whether, considering the qualifications of such teachers, he will suggest to the National Commissioners of Education the advisability of awarding them a higher rate of salary than that of an ordinary manual instructress.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) Eighty-three. The duties of manual instructresses are confined mainly to the lower standards in small schools having mixed attendances of boys and girls under masters, where the attendance is not sufficient to warrant the recognition of an assistant teacher. They all perform similar duties, and their remuneration compares favourably with that formerly given to workmistresses. There are no sufficient grounds for awarding different scales of remuneration as suggested.

Irish Teachers in Receipt of Pensions.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he can state the number of male and female teachers respectively at present in receipt of full pensions, the number in receipt of disablement pensions, also the highest amount payable as such.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The number of male and female teachers respectively at present in receipt of full pensions is—Males, 424; females, 395; total 819; disablement pensions—males, 24; females, 23; total, 47. The highest disablement pensions payable are—male, £14 4s. per annum; female, £14 7s. per annum.

London Recruiting Barracks.

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the result of the negotiations he stated, in reply to a Question in July last, were in progress as to the removal of the London recruiting from St. George's Barracks; whether any site has been purchased; if so, where; and when the building of the new recruiting barrack will be commenced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The site, for which negotiations were in progress, proved too expensive to purchase. The whole question is, therefore, still under consideration.

Government Assistance to Rifle Clubs.

Mr. FREDERICK WILSON (Norfolk, Mid.); To ask the Secretary of State for War if any assistance will be given to rifle clubs during the current year; and, if no financial assistance can be given, whether the use of Government ranges, when not otherwise required, will be granted without charge and free of rent to such clubs, provided that all expenses for markers and watchers are paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) It is not possible to give any financial assistance to rifle clubs during the current year. The control of the Government ranges rests in the hands of the General Officers Commanding-in-Chief, who will doubtless render any assistance that they can to such clubs.

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

*Mr. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) said, in rising to move that this Bill be read a second time, he felt the great difficulty in which a layman was placed in dealing with an extremely complicated question. He had devoted some time to find his way through the maze of legal decisions upon the points concerned in this Bill, and he found them very confusing. Even when he applied to some of the most learned lawyers in this House they had indicated to him that they were in almost as much confusion as himself, and they could not tell what the law really was. He was also free to admit that some of the proposals put forward in this Bill, when read for the first time by anyone who was not a lawyer and had not a very clear conception of the law of conspiracy, might look a little startling. As one without direct interest either as workman or employer he had endeavoured to look at this question impartially, and he had concluded that this Bill was one which he could recommend the House to accept.

He would first deal with the confusion existing in the state of the law and the diversity of the decisions, which he thought was a sound reason why something should be done to make the law clear. There was not only great diversity of opinion, but the confusion had been emphasised on fundamental points by decisions within the last few years, and those decisions when given had been given by seriously divided Courts. In one of the most important decisions there was an important minority amongst the Law Lords, and six of the Judges who were called in to advise with them differed from the decision which was ultimately arrived at. The result had been that when a decision had been given, afterwards it had been whittled away and further modified and guarded until it became difficult to understand. It was generally agreed that a bad motive could not make a lawful act illegal, but there was considerable difference in the judicial opinion upon that point. The law in cases of combination was not at all clear. Lord Bowen laid down that trade competition was recognised as an excuse for injurious interference with another trade by combined action, but Lord Herschell indicated in the case of "Allen *v.* Flood" that that was not the basis of the decision of the other Judges. This was already confusing and difficult. In "Lyons *v.* Wilkins" the trades union called out men who were working for a man named Schoenthal who was supplying material and goods to Lyons. They called out those men to assist them in their dispute with Lyons. That was declared to be illegal, and an injunction was granted against them. When they came to the question of traders in the great Mogul case it had been decided that it was quite legal for the great shipowners in their combination to coerce and compel the shipping agents in China so that they should not take freights for other shipowners. They were at liberty to coerce a third party to compel a second party to give them their freights. There was also the more recent case in Scotland, where the Glasgow fleshers had refused to do business with the salesmen if they supplied the co-operative stores. In order to drive the stores out of their particular business they brought pressure to bear by refusing to trade with them. It seemed to him that there was a great discrepancy in the law as it bore upon workmen on the one hand and traders on the other, because in one case they were allowed to bring pressure upon a third party, but in the other they were not. He wished to know, was it legal or not to induce the workmen of another employer to strike? Was the question of motive to be gone into? He found it difficult to follow the variations of meaning put upon such words as "motive," "object," and "purpose." An ordinary man was lost in the various meanings attributed to these words. It was rather important that as far as possible the law should be "understanded" by the plain man in the street and not only by the lawyers. An important point was whether it was legal for one man to persuade others to strike, and, if so, was it legal for two or three men to combine and persuade some other men to strike. In the decision given by Lord Davey in "Allen *v.* Flood," Lord Davey said—

> "An employer may discharge a workman (with whom he has no contract), or may refuse to employ one from the most mistaken, capricious, malicious, or morally reprehensible motives that can be conceived; but the workman has no right of action against him. It seems to me strange to say that the principal who does the act is under no liability, but the accessory who has advised him to do so, without any wrongful act, is under liability. To persuade a person to do or abstain from doing what that person is entitled at his own will to do or abstain from doing is lawful, and in some cases meritorious, although the result of the advice may be damage to another. This is not a case of conspiracy. I do not say whether, if it were, it would or would not make an essential difference."

A single individual might persuade men to withdraw from their employment, but Lord Davey thought it was doubtful, and he did not say whether it would be legal, for a trades union to persuade men to withdraw from their employment. These questions were vitally important, for they affected hundreds of thousands of men in this country in a most important matter affecting their every day life, namely, their wages, hours, and conditions of labour. It was, therefore, vital, as affecting one of their most important relations of life. Upon such a question the law should be clear, and it should not depend upon subtle distinctions and difficult interpretations of various words. Even learned lawyers could not say what the law was, and they could not tell trade unionists what they could or could not legally do under certain conditions. In these circumstances how could they expect unlearned working men to find their way through this maze of legal confusion, and yet they were bound by those laws and rendered liable for not obeying them. It was not fair, and it was not reasonable to ask the working men of this country to walk over this road which abounded in serious legal pitfalls.

His next point was that so far as the law had been clearly defined it was not what it was intended to be. He was aware that this question had been submitted to the Courts of law, and Courts of law had nothing to do with what was said in this House, although they had to decide upon the law as it now stood. He would deal for a moment with the decisions which had been given as to the legal interpretation of the law. His point was that the law as interpreted had been declared to be a different law from what it was intended to be. He should like to allude to what Lord Cairns said in the year 1875, when he introduced the Bill dealing with this subject. Everyone would admit that he was one of the greatest lawyers that this country had had during the last century. He read Mr. Russell Gurney's charge, and he said that this Bill was intended to make the law as set out in Mr. Russell Gurney's charge. That was the intention of the Act as declared by this great lawyer. Lord Cairns said on the July 26th, 1875—

> "The 6th George IV., the Act of 1826, abolished the Combination Laws, and made violence to person or property, or threats, or intimidation, or molestation, or obstruction with a view to interfere with masters or servants, a criminal offence. The first impression was that these forbidden acts were physical and mechanical acts, but by construction they were held to include the act of persuading in a peaceable manner. Accordingly, in order to meet this objection the 22nd Victoria was passed, which provided that an endeavour to persuade in a peaceable manner should not be deemed molestation or obstruction."

They did, then, deliberately, in the 22nd year of the late Queen, by Act of Parliament, what by this Bill we ask you to declare is law to-day. Lord Cairns went on—

> "Still, doubts arose upon the construction of the Act, and then came the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1871, which repealed both the previous enactments, and substituted other acts as criminal offences. Great dissatisfaction, however, was felt with the working of the Act of 1871, because the decisions upon it were not altogether uniform."

The same old story

> "The Recorder's charge in what was known as the "Cabinetmakers'" case embodied the law upon the subject. In the course of his charge the learned Recorder said"

—Lord Cairns quotes from Mr. Russell Gurney's charge—

> "'The question you will have to ask yourselves is whether the evidence shows that the defendants were guilty of obstructing and rendering difficult of access, the prosecutor's place of business, or whether anything which they did was calculated to deter or intimidate those who were passing to and fro, or whether there was an exhibition of force calculated to produce fear in the minds of ordinary men, or whether the defendants or any of them combined for that purpose. If you think that, it seems to me, then it will be your duty to find a true bill; but if you think their conduct may be accounted for by a desire to ascertain who were the persons working there, or peaceably to persuade them or any others who were proposing to work there to join their fellow-workmen, who were contending, whether rightly or wrongly, for the interests of the general body, it seems to me that there is no evidence sufficient to establish the charge that is here made.'"

There Mr. Russell Gurney clearly lays down that peaceable persuasion was legal and Lord Cairns is quoting that. Lord Cairns goes on—

> "This expression of the law in the Recorder's charge appeared to the Home Secretary to be exactly the intention and scope of the Act of 1871, and, so far as he was concerned, his right hon. friend would have been content to trust that application of the Act in future cases. The working men, too, would, he believed, have been satisfied with that construction of the Act. The House of Commons thought, however, that it was not desirable to leave the question open to any doubt whatever, and words were accordingly introduced into the present Bill in order that future rulings in similar cases should be placed on the same footing as the case tried by the Recorder. After anxious consideration, and with valuable assistance in the House of Commons, the Home Secretary had endeavoured to frame a clause which should free the matter from future doubt."

That was the intention of that Act, and it was intended specially to make it perfectly clear that peaceful persuasion was perfectly legal. The Home Secretary of that day, Mr. Cross, had Mr. Russell Gurney's charge specially printed and sent round to the magistrates in order that they might know what the Government interpretation of the Act was. There they had a clear proof that the recent decisions which declared peaceful persuasion to be illegal were contrary to the distinct intentions when the Act passed this House. He knew this was not an argument for the law Courts, but it was an argument for Parliament, more especially when the law had been administered for thirty years without any inconvenience to the people of this country.

As to the liability of trades union funds, it was also thought to be clear in the Act. He thought no one would dispute the soundness of the legal decisions which had been given. His point was that great lawyers thought that was the law, and right up to the last everybody acted upon it as if it was the law. In that great case the Court of Appeal decided that it was the law. It was only when it got to the House of Lords that the new version was put on it. The first clause of the Bill was simply for the purpose of definitely legalising that persuasion which it was the object of the Act of 1875 to make perfectly clear, and he submitted that peaceful persuasion was proper, harmless, and absolutely necessary if trades unions were to have any reasonable and useful existence. The law provided for trades unionists attending in the vicinity of works, or homes, or anywhere that might be necessary, in order to obtain and convey information. It was thought that that covered peaceful persuasion. Lord Cairns thought it did. It was monstrous not to permit trades unionists to attend and persuade peacefully their fellow-workmen not to enter into competition with them when they had disputes with their employers. He knew it was said that was allowable now, and that it was unnecessary to enact this. There had been a question as to whether it was allowable, but if it was allowable now there could not be any harm in making it perfectly clear. With all deference he ventured to submit that it was not legal now, and he would ask this question—Would attending in the same way near the home or near the works to obtain and convey information be legal if it was not specially provided for in the Act of 1875? If it would, why was it provided for? If it would not, then to attend for the purpose of legal persuasion was illegal because it was not provided for. He went further. In the case of "Lyons *v.* Wilkins" the Court of Appeal, in 1896, confirmed an injunction restraining trades union officials—

> "From watching or besetting the plaintiff's works for the purpose of persuading or otherwise preventing persons from working for them, or for any purpose except merely to obtain or communicate information."

Lord Justice Kay said—

> "I hold distinctly that it is illegal to picket the works or place of business of a man by persons who are distributed there for the purpose of trying by persuasion to induce the workmen not to work for him any longer, or to induce people who want to work for him to abstain from entering into an agreement with him to do so."

Lord Justice of Lindley said—

> "Now they were not there merely to obtain or communicate information; that is not their function. They were there to put pressure on Messrs. Lyons by persuading people not to enter their employment, and that is watching and besetting within Clause 4; that is not attending merely to obtain or communicate information. Under these circumstances they have gone too far, and have gone beyond what the Act of Parliament authorises, and I do not hesitate to say that it is a case in which, from the necessity of the thing, a quick remedy is actually and absolutely required."

In a circular which has been sent round by the Miners' Association it is stated that—

> "Under the existing law persons may be peacefully persuaded, provided the method employed does not constitute a nuisance to other people."

That was not so. There was no nuisance whatever in the case of Lyons. It was admitted by the plaintiff, and taken as a fact by the Court, that the pickets used no violence, intimidation, or threats. There were only four persons engaged in that picket, there were never more than two of them at a time. They were there in relays of two. Could anything be more peaceful? They were there for the purpose of peacefully persuading others, and yet that was an evil for which Lord Lindley said that a quick remedy was actually and absolutely required. They could not have more peaceful persuasion than by two men attending to persuade without any threat or intimidation. It was very proper and reasonable conduct, but, unfortunately, it was illegal. There was another case—"Charnock *v.* Court"—in which Mr. Justice Stirling gave the decision. This was in connection with a strike at Halifax. Men were brought from Ireland to fill the places of the men who were striking. Two men went from Halifax to Fleetwood to be on the landing stage when the vessel arrived bringing thirteen men from Ireland. These two men persuaded the thirteen men not to go to Halifax, and they paid their fares to go elsewhere. That was declared to be illegal. Could there be more peaceful persuasion than that by two men who had to go away 100 miles from the scene of the strike to a landing stage to persuade men not to work? And yet they were told that peaceful persuasion was not illegal. He was justified in saying that peaceful persuasion was not legal under the law. It would be illegal for one man to watch outside a house in order to persuade a man not to work, because that would be watching in the sense of the law. He was not allowed to watch unless it was simply to obtain or convey information. They were told that this clause would permit men to molest, terrorise, and intimidate, and that they should have a great crowd attending? Nothing of the kind. That was not the desire of the trades unionists of the country, and, if it was, it would not be legal. If a great crowd attended, watching and besetting a house without attempting to persuade, who could contend that they were trying to peacefully persuade. A large crowd could not contend that they were there for peaceful persuasion. Force, violence, and intimidation, following, were now and would be still illegal under the Act of 1875. They might say that peaceful persuasion might develop into terrorism and violence. Well, but they were not to punish a legal act because an illegal one might develop from it. Peaceful controversy between two individuals might develop into a fight, but they did not say that peaceful controversy should be illegal because somebody sometimes fought. They must deal with the fight and the illegality when it occurred, but they should not deny men the power of peaceful argument and peaceful persuasion.

Further, they had a little light thrown on what would be the effect of this. The House was aware that attending in order to convey and obtain information was legal. He would read a short extract from a decision by Lord Justice Lindley on that point. In the case of "Lyons *v.* Wilkins" he said—

> "It would be wrong to post people about a place of business or a house under pretence of merely obtaining or communicating information if the object and effect were to compel the person so picketed not to do that which he has a perfect right to do."

Molesting, obstructing, threatening, and coercing were illegal, they should be illegal, and they would continue to be illegal, but argument and persuasion should not be made illegal. Persuasion was essential to the carrying on of a strike. This House long years ago decided, and decided wisely, that strikes must be legalised, and if strikes were to be legalised they must legalise the method by which they could be properly and peacefully carried on. Persuasion was absolutely essential to the carrying on of a strike. The strikers must wait about to catch the men and reason with those who were being brought in from distant places by the employers, and perfectly rightly by the employers. The employers were perfectly justified in scouring the country to get men to fill the places of the men on strike. That was perfectly legitimate, but he contended that it should be equally legitimate for the men without threat, violence, or intimidation to meet these men at the railway-station, in the street, or wherever they could find them, argue with them, and persuade them not to go to take their places. That was absolutely essential if a strike was to be conducted. If it should be thought that more was required than was now in it, there was no objection to put in words to make the clause perfectly clear. Clause 2 reads as follows—

> "An agreement or combination by two or more persons to do or procure to be done any act in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute shall not be ground for an action, if such act, when committed by one person, would not be ground for an action."

The wording of that followed very closely Clause 3 of the Act of 1875.

That Act protected men in combination against criminal action if the act done would not be a criminal act when done by one person only. This clause was simply to carry that exemption into effect in civil proceedings. As the law now stood, trades unions were free from criminal proceedings when the act done by a trades union was an act which would not be criminal in the case of one person. This clause provided that they should be equally free from civil proceedings if the act done in union was one which would not involve a civil action if done by one man only. That would go far to equalise the position between traders and workmen. A combination of traders for their own trade benefit, even if it meant the injury and crushing out of innocent competing traders, was legal under the law. Lord Justice Bowen put this very plainly in the Mogul case. He said—

> "The just excuse for inflicting ruin on the dissentient shipowners was that instinct of self-advancement and self-protection which was the incentive of all trade."

Traders were justified under the law in inflicting ruin on others in competition with them, and yet working men were to be restrained far within these limits. Lord Morris put the position of the capitalist and the trader in the same case very strongly. He said—

> "The object was a lawful one. It is not illegal for a trader to aim at driving a competitor out of trade, provided the motive be his own gain by appropriation of the trade, and the means he uses be lawful weapons. . . . Again, what one trader may do in respect of competition a body or set of traders can lawfully do."

That was what they asked in connection with the working men, that what one trader might do in respect of competition a body or set of men might lawfully do. That was, in promoting their own trade interest, they in combination should be permitted to do what it would be legal for one to do. What he asked—and he wished to be precise on this point—was that workmen in promoting their "trade" interest should be placed in the same position. On this point he would quote what Lord Justice Bowen had said in the Mogul case in 1883. Discussing whether a combination of capitalists differentiated the case of acts jointly done by them from similar acts done by a single man of capital, his Lordship said—

> "I find it impossible myself to acquiesce in the view that the English law places any such restriction on the combination of capital as would be involved in the recognition of such a distinction. If so, one rich capitalist may innocently carry competition to a length which would become unlawful in the case of a syndicate with a joint capital no larger than his own, and one individual merchant may lawfully do that which a firm or a partnership may not. What limits, on such a theory, would be imposed by law on the competitive action of a Joint Stock Company, Limited, is a problem which might well puzzle a casuist. The truth is, that the combination of capital for purposes of trade and competition is a very different thing from such a combination of several persons against one, with a view to harm him, as falls under the head of an indictable conspiracy."

But a trade combination would not be a combination for the purpose of harming; the predominant motive was that it was to benefit themselves and to promote their own interests—

> "There is no just cause or excuse in the latter class of cases. There is such a just cause or excuse in the former. There are cases in which the very fact of a combination is evidence of a design to do that which is hurtful without just cause—is evidence—to use a technical expression—of malice. But it is perfectly legitimate, as it seems to me, to combine capital for all the mere purposes of trade for which capital may, apart from combination, be legitimately used in trade. To limit combinations of capital, when used for purposes of competition, in the manner proposed by the argument of the plaintiff, would, in the present day, be impossible—would be only another method of attempting to set boundaries to the tides."

All that he asked was that trade unions should be placed in the same position as capitalists. So long ago as 1851, Mr. Justice Erle in "Reg. *v.* Rowlands," said that—

> "The intention of the law is at present to allow either of them to follow the dictates of their own will with respect to their own actions and their own property; and either, I believe, has a right to study to promote his own advantage, or to combine with others to promote their mutual advantage."

Lord Justice Bowen quoted this case in support of his views as to the position of traders in the Mogul case. The present Colonial Secretary, two years ago, said—

> "The law, in his opinion, operated harshly against trade unions."

It was not clear that a labour dispute was a defence against civil actions for injury through a dispute because of combination. Although decisions were

Mr. Whittaker.

conflicting the balance of judgment appeared to be that combined action which intentionally injured another in his trade was illegal, unless just cause or excuse could be shown. Then it was sometimes said that if this clause was passed such conduct as everybody condemned, and which took place in the case of "Quinn *v.* Leathem," would be practically justified. He ventured to say that that was not so. That was a case of vindictive action, the sole object of which was to punish and injure Leathem. There was no trade dispute within the meaning of the Act of 1875. The trade dispute was all over, and the action then taken would not have been legalised under this clause. Lord Brampton made that perfectly clear in the case. His Lordship said—

> "It could not be—it had not even been suggested—that these acts were done in furtherance of any of the lawful objects of the association as set forth in their registered rules, according to the statutory requirements, nor in support of any lawful right of the association, or any member of it, nor to obtain or maintain fair hours of labour or fair wages, nor to promote a fair understanding between employers and employed, and workman and workman."

Such proceedings would still be actionable; and if any real doubt existed it could be made perfectly clear when the Bill was in Committee. Trade unions were combinations, and in the disputes which took place the working men could not act as individuals. They were bound to act in combination. It had to be decided in the public interest that men should be enabled to combine in their unions and strike; and if they were to do that effectually they must be relieved from the burden of the law, as it now pressed on them, in regard to combination and conspiracy. They must be relieved as the traders and capitalists were relieved, and so long as they did not do anything which would be illegal in the individual, it should be legal for them as a union to do. Personal liability, both civil and criminal, would remain untouched; and the proposed legislation would make workmen and employers equal in the same way as traders and capitalists were now equal.

Clause 3 provided that trade union funds should not be liable to civil procedure; that was to say, that they could not be sued in consequence of the action of any of their members. It was never thought that they were liable till 1900. He would point out that that question had never been raised in the Courts for thirty years. Everybody believed that trade union funds were protected; that had never been doubted. Even the Appeal Court decided that they were not liable. It was only the House of Lords that had decided that they were. It did seem an anomaly that large corporations, having funds, should not be liable for anything that their representatives might do. But it must be remembered that, when dealing with trade unions, they were dealing with bodies which Parliament had, in 1871, deliberately and wisely placed in a special and anomalous position. Trade unions were not, under that Act, given the rights, privileges, and liabilities of corporate bodies. Trade unions could not be registered as companies, as benefit societies, or as industrial societies. It was believed for thirty years that they could not be sued, and for thirty years they were not sued. None of the terrible misfortunes which they were told would follow the passage of the Act of 1871 did follow during those thirty years. The arrangement worked well. It might not be logical, but the Lord Chancellor had recently declared that our laws were not logical. Many of them were, however, practical, and worked satisfactorily. If trade unions continued to be made liable, means of evasion would be discovered. But with what result? Trade unions would be weakened, control of the officials and of the executive would be weakened, and responsibility would be weakened; and that would be a very undesirable thing for the nation as a whole. If this Bill were passed individuals would always remain liable. That would be a sufficient deterrent. Working men would think more of their own skins than of their trade union funds.

Some people said: "Oh, we object to this special legislation to protect the interests of the working classes." He ventured to remind the House that in the past history of this country there had been a great deal of special legislation passed the other way. He called to mind the Statute of Limitations in the reign of Edward III.; the Statute of Apprentices in Elizabeth's time; the legislation of James I. for regulating strictly the conditions, wages, and hours of labour under which men should work, and compelling them to work for those who wanted them to work, not allowing them to move away where they wanted. There was a great deal of legislation in behalf of the employers, and some of it very stringent legislation. In 1800, and up to the year 1825, it was punishable by statute for workmen to combine in order to improve their wages and condition. And what was the result of that stringent legislation in the first quarter of last century? The relations between employers and workmen were more strained and difficult than ever they had been before or since, and there was violence and outrage. Wonderfully better conditions between employer and workmen had prevailed during the past thirty years, and that was mainly due to the position in which the trade unions had been put. Trade unions had been given greater power, and *status*, and responsibility; and they had risen to that responsibility. It had improved their position; but the recent decisions of the House of Lords had paralysed them. Employers might rejoice. It was, perhaps, natural that they should, when feeling ran high. He quite understood that employers should be very glad to have the power of the trade unions checked and limited; but he ventured to say that it would not be, in the long run, good for them or for the unions. Trade unions in this country had enormously improved the character, condition, and self-respect of the working men, and had given them an independent position; and it would be a calamity if that independence, which had been for the good of all, were seriously crippled.

He, and those who supported this Bill, had no desire that there should be any facility given for terrorising or acting wrongfully. All that they wanted was that trade unionists should be able to exercise their ordinary civil rights. Nor was he there to defend everything done by trade unions and trade unionists. They might occasionally have acted wilfully, have, at times, been short-sighted and self-willed, and have acted somewhat tyrannously; but what of the employers? Was there any man in the House who would approve of everything they had done, or say that they had always acted wisely? Were they to indict a whole class simply because there had been weakness here, and shortcomings there? Employers were human; and trade unionists were human. Both had committed faults; but, on the whole, he ventured to say that the trade unions of this country had done remarkably well. And he thought that no greater testimony could be given to the wisdom of the legislation of the last half century than the men who sat in this House as distinctive labour representatives. He thought it would be admitted on all sides that there were no men in this House, of any class, who were more entitled to, and did not more receive, the respect of every Member of the House. Test them as they would: for character, ability, for general bearing in the House, they bore comparison with any section of the House. And these were the chosen representatives of those unions and of those classes in behalf of whom he appealed for this Bill. The policy of the past had been abundantly justified. It gave working men special facilities and freedom to work out their own interests and to defend their own position. We in this country were a law-abiding people; and there was more respect for law and constitutional authority among the masses of the people than was to be found in any other nation on the face of the earth. He ventured to say that that was because they had more freedom. The effect of the recent decision would do harm, and it might even beget danger. Thirty years ago trade unions were brought out into the light of day. He remembered one of the first great Blue-books he read was the Report of the Commission in 1857 on the outbreaks at Sheffield and elsewhere. The result was not to bring more oppressive legislation to bear on the trade unions but to free them, bring them out into the light of day, and to trust their leaders. Nothing could be more satisfactory or beneficial. The trade unions had justified the confidence reposed in them. Let that confidence be restored. Let the law be restored to the position in which it stood before; at the same time, put down ever and with a stern hand molestation, threats, and intimidation, but give the men every facility to promote their own interests peacefully and properly, and, thereby, remove all temptation to resort to objectionable practices. He begged to move.

*Mr. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.) said he desired to thank the hon. Gentleman on behalf of himself and his colleagues for the very high, perhaps the too high, tribute for their deserts which he had paid to the Labour Members. He thought, however, that he might fairly say that they had always tried to comport themselves in the past in a respectful and honourable manner. He also wished to express the pleasure with which he had listened to the very able speech of the hon. Gentleman and to thank him for the very clear and convincing manner in which he had brought the question before the House. He thought the speech was listened to with pleasure by hon. Members in all parts of the House, and he desired to thank the hon. Gentleman in the names of the trade unions of the country for his action. So great was the interest taken in this Bill that there were at the present moment within the precincts of the House fully 200 of the leading men of the trade unions of the country, so valuable did they regard it. He thanked the hon. Gentleman for his defence of trade unions and for the manly way in which, in his beautiful peroration, he showed that instead of being instruments of evil and institutions of wrong, as men would make them out to be, they were one of the largest elements in the welfare and progress of this country that had been in operation during the last thirty years.

It would be a piece of conceit on his part if he said that he would discuss this question from the lawyer's point of view. He did not approach it as a lawyer, and he would be candid and say that he did not approach it as a trade unionist; he approached it as a citizen of a great and industrial country, and he believed that unless there was some remedy, some definition given to the position in which they found themselves, that, instead of peaceful accord, compromise, and growing conciliation, he was very much afraid that there would be a repetition, or at least an approach to the state of things which existed thirty years ago. At present the question was in the clouds; it was in a kind of chaos; and they were asking where they were. The Home Secretary himself acknowledged that there was very great unrest in the country, and that that unrest should be allayed. The right hon. Gentleman said that some steps should be taken, but he guarded himself by adding that those steps should not be taken until after the Commission had reported. The programme of the Government, however, was not as heroic as in previous sessions; they were now thinking nationally and not Imperially; and it would have been better if they had inserted in their programme a Bill to remedy the grievances of trade unionists and to define the law regarding them. They had had two or three stages in connection with the measure. Last session the Government removed their embargo; he did not say it was an open and avowed embargo, but it was a tacit embargo. The House was given a freer hand, and there was a sudden rebound in the voting; a minority of thirty being converted into a majority of thirty-nine. The question was so important that he did not think it was necessary to wait for the Report of the Commission; especially when they remembered that the Commission was one-sided. If it were a Commission to inquire into the relations between employer and employee why were the most important interests in the country unrepresented? Why was there not on the Commission a representative of the principal trade unions. He had read of a Commission very much like this. It was described in Washington Irving's Knickerbocker's History of New York. He said that the reason why, and the cause of, the crooked streets in New York was because the matter was referred to a Commission of Dutchmen, and while they were deliberating on the construction of the city the cows made tracks down to the river and the squatters built their houses before the Commission reported. He thought the present Commission instead of expediting, would delay the business they had in hand; and therefore the Government would do well to include this measure in their sessional programme. He said with all due deference that it would have been better if, instead of including Chinese labour last year, they had dealt with the trade union question.

The position he laid down was that the trade unions of this country were a large element in its commercial progress and stability. All they required was concord, compromise, and conciliation, and it should be the aim of all parties to try and establish and enlarge, as far as they could, that feeling and that spirit. From the national point of view, he thought the Government would do well to assist this Bill through the House in order that it might pass into law this session, and that they might know exactly were they stood. It was not necessary to dilate on the views of trade unionists after the full statement of the hon. Gentleman, but his experience went back prior to 1871. He was a trade unionist at the time the Sheffield Commission met, he had seen men called out of their beds at night, manacled and sent to prison, because they asserted the highest duty and the greatest privilege of human life, namely, endeavouring to get the best price for their labour it was possible to get. If the House wanted to get any worse character of him than it had, he might state that he led a strike when he was fifteen years of age; now he was not only entering on the sere and yellow but the sedate period of life and took a calmer view of the position of affairs. All the trade unions wanted prior to 1875 was protection for their funds, the settlement of internal disputes without resorting to law, immunity from collective liability, and the repeal of all criminal legislation applied to working men as such. He preferred the bold attitude of the hon. Gentleman who intended to move the rejection of the Bill to the policy of evasion which would defer the matter until the Commission had reported. He always preferred a frank opponent; but he would ask the hon. Gentleman not to dwell upon future forebodings or fears, but to state, in his experience of thirty years, any instances in which he could complain of the action of trade unions. He thought he might safely say that his colleagues and himself on many occasions were credited with a double portion of original sin. During the last thirty years—since 1875—he would venture to say, through acting on the advice and desires of trades union leaders, there had been a gradual coming together of the employers and employed. There had been introduced into their relations the gradual use of conciliation.

Immediately the Act of 1875 was passed the managing committee of the Durham Miners' Organisation, of which he was a member, sought to establish a sliding scale for the peaceful regulation of their labour. But they were not alone in that, on every hand responsible trades union leaders sought to arrange something whereby the relations between their unions and the employers might be settled without resorts to force or law, or in any way beyond conciliation. The progress which conciliation had made was shown by the fact that in 1898 there were 16,000 people whose relations with their employers had been regulated by conciliation, and in 1901 that number had increased to 570,000. He appealed to any employer in this House to say whether conciliation had not put money in his pocket. He put it, on the low level of money, whether conciliation had not obviated strikes many a time, and whether it was wise on the part of employers to risk the hindrance and the retarding of the growth of that spirit. Were he an employer he would foster it by every means in his power, because trust begat trust and force evoked force, and if men could not defend themselves in the light of day they would defend themselves in the darkness. Let him put the matter in another way. From the complaints and forebodings they had heard, they might believe that every day riot ran rampant through their ranks and the field of commerce, but he ventured to say there was no country on the face of this earth where there was less disturbance than in this country. Without going into the definition of words, and without saying that the employers had all the virtues and the men all the vices of human life, let them say that each had a share of both. He was not going to say that the employers with whom he had to do were anything more or anything less than men. Let the employers say the same of them. The importance of this question demanded its settlement. It was not a Party question and it ought not to be. There were questions about which Parties might conflict, but this question lay at the root of the industrial stability of this country. We came nearer to the Continent every day by transit, and were brought into greater competition with foreign countries. Could anyone think for a moment that by depleting the funds of the trade unions they would destroy strikes? He had seen more deplorable strikes in cases where there was not a penny in the fund than where the organisations concerned had a large fund. It was suggested that where the men had a large fund they guarded it, and were chary of engaging in any action which might jeopardise it. Let not employers run away with the idea that lack of money would prevent strikes. If men felt aggrieved, though they had not a cent, they would resent it and fight. Let them not think they would prevent a strike by depleting a union of its funds.

Let them look at this question from the broad position of the national view. From that point of view the sooner a decision was given the better, and the sooner the Government took the matter in hand the better for all concerned. He was about to give a few quotations as to the haziness of this question, and he recollected reading somewhere that "out of the eater cometh meat," and they sometimes got sweetness from their enemies. The hon. Member for Stretford had stated on a previous occasion that they were in a precarious position in regard to this matter, and that the sooner it was settled the better. The hon. Member said—

> "Too much at the present time was left with the Judge and too little definition laid down by the Legislature to enable him to deal with a very difficult subject matter."

He agreed they ought not to have Judge-made law upon a question of this sort. They should have rules and regulations laid down by Parliament. He now desired to point an argument used by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary against this Bill some two years ago. He respected the Home Secretary very much, but really the right hon. Gentleman's argument was the *reductio ad absurdum*. It was that if this Bill was passed it would be competent for a man to come to his knocker and go away, and another man to come to his knocker, and forty or fifty men to come to his knocker, until it would become a nuisance. He submitted that a question of this kind should not be dealt with in that way. Another argument which the right hon. Gentleman used was that it was bestowing a privilege on a particular class. It was bestowing no privilege whatever. All they asked for was the liberty to use their power to persuade. In human life that was one of its perquisites; if you took out of it the power of persuasion human life would be barren; both Parties tried it at election times on the platforms of the country, they tried to persuade. They had all tried it on their sweethearts, why should not the trade unionist try it upon his fellow-workman. How would this appear to the simple minded workman who saw his employer bringing workmen from other places, not because of the love his employer had for him, but in order to prevent the workman from bettering his condition, either by obtaining shorter hours or higher wages. If he attempted to persuade those men to go away he immediately found that he was, if not a criminal, amenable to the law of the land. He would say to himself that "this is a strange thing that my employer can do that which I may not do." That was a simple statement of the fact, but it was the true one.

He had heard it stated — he hoped it was not true — that the employers of the country had thrown the burden of circularising on this question upon the mineowners of the North. He hoped it was not true, but it was a strange coincidence that they had not received any circulars from any other associations. That being so, they might assume that the statement was correct. He therefore appealed to the coalowners in this House to give some instances of some serious cases that had happened in the last few years in justification of the statements they had made. He was sorry to see the organisation of the employers of the North lending themselves to these fears and forebodings. He had a circular sent to him by an association, with which he as the corresponding secretary for the Miners had a deal to do so far as Durham was concerned, and he ventured to say that there was not a single phase of their relations that was not covered by conciliation. If he went to compel any man then let them make him liable for his act, but if he went to persuade let them not restrict his God-given privilege to speak; as he had a right to speak in a straightforward way. As things stood now the workmen were in a position of inequality, all they asked for was justice. Anything that depleted the union funds was of course to the benefit of the employers, and naturally they supported the opposition to this Bill. Now all he said was "Give us fair play." He would concede this, if a committee or an organisation deputed any man whatever to do that which might be wrong he had no objection to it being made liable, because it was the union itself which was doing it. But if he went to a place where there was a strike without the sanction of the committee, and urged the men to do that which was wrong he ought to be punished, and the funds ought not to be mulcted. The day had come when they should drop all reference to the Taff Vale and other cases. Let the dead past bury its dead. Let them start anew. Let them have a law fair, honourable, and just to every man. He did not want to repel the two interests in the commercial world; he wanted amicability and concord to be centripetal forces, and as he believed this Bill contained the principle of binding force he had great pleasure in seconding the Motion for its Second Reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*SIR THOMAS WRIGHTSON (St. Pancras, E.) said he would not like the impression to get abroad that he was moving that the Bill be read a second time that day six months in any spirit of hostility towards trade unionism. The last speaker challenged him, as a large employer of labour in the North of England, to state his view with regard to the work of trade unions in that part of the country, and he had great pleasure in telling him that the action of these unions there had been extremely beneficial. No doubt both for employers and employed it was of enormous advantage that they should have an organisation to deal with. When employers had to meet a large number of workmen it was extremely difficult to arrive at their real views, and, therefore, it was most desirable that there should be some recognised union which gathered up the different threads and which was accepted by the workmen as authorised to present their views. He quite concurred with both the mover and seconder that there was a very great advantage in the existence of strong trade unions. He qualified the sentence by the use of the word "strong," because there was a very great difference indeed between strong and weak unions. They had had the benefit of strong unions in the North of England, and he could not too much exaggerate the result of that benefit; they had had very few strikes in Northumberland and Durham. He had been in business for a great portion of his life in that part of the country and he was consequently perfectly familiar with the conditions of industry there, and he was glad to know that they had in that House men from that district who enjoyed the respect of Members on both sides as well as the confidence of their constituents in the North. He marvelled, however, that the strong unions should throw in their lot with the weaker unions in asking for such an enormous concession as was embodied in that Bill. He could not say that he approved of the Bill under any circumstances, even if it was to be administered only by those who were connected with strong unions, but he did oppose any legislation of that kind, considering the difficulties associated with the whole legal aspect of the question, and he did think it would be a great mistake to apply any such principles to the industrial interests of this country.

He did not propose to go into the legal question, for he was to be followed by a very sound lawyer who would be better able to deal with that matter. He would simply remark that there had been very great confusion caused by the decisions recently given as to what could and could not be done in trade disputes. The whole question was in an unsettled condition, and that, no doubt, was an unfortunate state of things. The sooner it was remedied the better. But they were discussing on that occasion, not so much the remedy as the procedure for securing that remedy, and that was where the great difference came in between his views and those entertained by hon. Gentlemen opposite. What had in the past been believed to be the law as to the liability of trade unions had been utterly upset by recent decisions given in the law Courts. Was the House of Commons a tribunal likely to settle a question of that kind? He said distinctly that it was not. [A Voice: What are we here for?] They were not there to deal with legal questions, to do that they must have a direct leading of some sort. A Royal Commission was appointed some time since to deal with the question, and some criticisms had been offered because no member of the Labour Party had been placed upon it. But he understood that a certain gentleman was put on it because he was known to take a very deep interest in labour matters and to enjoy the confidence of the Labour Party. [Cries of "No."] At any rate, he understood that that was the idea in selecting that gentleman; he was also told that the labour leaders were invited to give evidence before the Commission and, unfortunately, refused to do so. He held that in the darkness with which they were surrounded in connection with the legal aspects of the question they would not be justified in attempting to pass a Bill of that kind without the light which they might expect to receive from the investigations conducted by the Royal Commission. That was the principal ground upon which he opposed the Motion for the Second Reading of that Bill. If only they could have introduced legislation on lines recommended by the Royal Commission and embodying probably the views of hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House there could be no doubt that that would be the best method of procedure, in view of the fact that they were so much hampered by the obscurity created by recent legal decisions. Last year they had a distinct pronouncement from the Prime Minister, who declared that in passing a Bill of that kind they had not to consider in the first place the interests of employers or workmen or the merits or demerits of trades unionism, but rather the interests of society as a whole, and the right hon. Gentleman suggested to the House that, in the absence of such assistance as might be derived from the Royal Commission, it was inadvisable to attempt to pass legislation of the nature proposed. The situation had not been altered since the Prime Minister uttered those words; it was practically the same to-day as a year ago.

He would like to say a few words with regard to the present powers possessed by trade unions. In this Bill they were asking for a great extension of their powers. But what were their present powers, and how did they compare with the position occupied by employers of labour. They must remember that the employer of labour had to invest his capital in plant at a certain spot, and it was of great importance to him that his trade should be carried on there, whereas the individual workman could take away his labour, which, after all, was his capital, to some other part of the world at any moment he chose. He was not, in fact, hampered by the same considerations of fixity of capital. Employers of labour, in order to carry on their business, were also compelled to make contracts, and they therefore ran the risk that the men they employed might at any time demand a higher wage than was provided for in the estimate for the work. All these things ought to be considered. The workmen had a great deal of power as compared with employers. Let them go back to the origin of trade unions. Their first function was simply to watch the interests of labour with regard to wages, but they had now gone a good deal beyond that; they dictated terms of employment, and even the number of apprentices; they dictated the amount of work to be done by either man or machine, and they also dealt with questions of overtime and piecework, and the discharge of non-union men. The question was whether in the general interests of the commerce and trade of this country it was wise to give such an increase of power as this Bill proposed. There was no doubt, after the condition which had been created as to the want of exactness in the law, that some change would have to be made, but everything pointed to the undesirability of hasty legislation. If such a measure as this were passed, it would probably be found when the Report of the Royal Commission was published that they had passed a Bill of a character entirely different from the recommendations of that Commission, and which would not commend itself to the approval of the country. The powers of trade unions had a very important bearing upon the cost of the production of the employees. They tended to the restriction of the labour of the individual, and, consequently, to increase of cost. That was very important from the point of view of the interests and progress of employment in this country. Strong unions and weak unions were necessarily bracketed together, but legislation which in the hands of a strong union was harmless might, in the hands of a weak union, led by weak men, result in great harm being done. This country had never had freedom of trade in the fiscal sense; he hoped they might, at all events, have freedom in labour, and that masters and men might determine between themselves their rates of wages without the interference of a weak union.

It was said that the unions were too high-minded to begin the practice of picketing. It was all very well to make such professions, but a circular had been sent by one of the trade unions telling Members that their votes would be watched and their names sent to all the trade unions in the country. What was that but picketing? And the unions had commenced it very early by attempting the coercive or "peaceable persuasion" of Members of Parliament. He was sorry to oppose a measure brought in by trade unions, which he did not hesitate to acknowledge had done him so much good in the past. As an employer of labour he had had little trouble with strikes, having always been able to arrange matters with his men. Therefore, he had no feeling whatever against trade unions, but he did implore them to move slowly in this matter, and not to press forward a Bill which would never receive the sympathy and assent of the country. He suggested that action should be deferred until they had the information to be supplied by the Royal Commission, which would enable them to deal with the matter in a proper way. Many Members who were going to vote for the Bill had told him they did not believe in it. They were being driven by the circular, which practically threatened to knock them out of the House of Commons at the next election if they voted against the Bill. He did not intend to give way to any such pressure. He had stated his reasons for opposing the Bill. Honestly desiring the law to be brought into the shape most suited to the requirements of the trade of the country, he was in favour of some change, but he did not think it ought to be in the direction of giving such enormously increased powers to trade unions. He begged to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

*MR. DUKE (Plymouth), in seconding the Amendment, said that if he could have reconciled his view of what he ought to do with not voting against the Second Reading of this Bill he would gladly have done so, not because of the "peaceable persuasion" to which reference had been made, but solely with a view to the public interests involved in the Bill and, not least among them, the great interest of the country as a whole in the strength and effectiveness of trade unions. He did not object at all to "peaceable persuasion" of Members of Parliament; every man interested had a right to tell hon. Members that their working-class constituents or any other body of their constituents would watch their votes. But before any such persuasion was applied he had had to consider this Bill, and had told the Trades Council in his own constituency that the Bill proceeded on lines which were absolutely inadmissible and did not afford a means of settlement of this question. He fully recognised that there was a large section of the working classes which desired this Bill to pass. That was a factor to be considered, but it was not the governing factor. The House of Commons had to consider whether the Bill was one which ought to pass, whether it was a good or a bad Bill, and he had come to the conclusion that it was a bad Bill, which could not be satisfactorily amended in Committee, and which, therefore, he ought to oppose on Second Reading.

It had been said that there was great confusion in this branch of law. He thought, however, that there was not more confusion in this than in some other of the higher ranges of legal discussion. There were ranges of law in which every question was a contentious question. No human ingenuity could settle the law of a country so that there should be no contentious questions. Personally, he did not believe that on the great principles of the law relating to trade unions there was the perplexity which had been referred to. There was doubtless a variety of views among eminent lawyers on questions not immediately raised by the statutes relating to trade unions, but which came in collaterally, and which had had the effect of procuring apparently divergent decisions upon sets of facts closely resembling one another. He agreed as to the desirability of having a code of trade union law. Criminal law and the law relating to Bills of Exchange had been codified, but neither came nearly so close to the daily life of great masses of the people as the law with regard to combination and the law which governed employers and employed in their mutual relations. This Bill did not profess to codify the law. It introduced privileges for one of the strongest bodies, if not the strongest organised body, in the country, and the question the House had to consider was whether it was proper that organisations guided by men of ability such as was shown in this House by the Labour Members, possessing millions of members, millions of annual revenue, and millions of invested funds, should be placed in a position of privilege by a decision of this House. The Bill not only gave exceptional privileges: it gave them to one of the most strongly organised bodies in the country.

It was because this Bill made that proposal that he could not vote for it. It was said that the Taff Vale case was a great disappointment. He did not think it surprised many lawyers except on the question of procedure. If a number of persons combined to cause damage to others the law declared that the whole of those persons and their funds would be held liable. When it was said there was disappointment, he would invite attention to both the Majority and Minority Reports of the Royal Commission of 1869. Both Reports stated, with regard to the Bill then proposed, that it ought not to affect the liability of every person to be sued in respect of any damage or loss which might have been occasioned to any other person through any act or default of the person sued. That was a very clear enunciation of the principle which must underlie the law of every civilised country. If, contrary to the law, a man or a body of men caused damage to others, then to the extent of their means they must pay for it. To provide by legislation that the trade unions of this country should be put outside the operation of that principle, which was at the foundation of all civilised law, was a denial in respect of trade unionists of an elementary duty of citizenship. But he did not admit that there was this disappointment that had been spoken of. What was felt with regard to trade unions in the period before 1900 was rather that they were fortunate in being protected from legal procedure by difficulties which spring from the law as to procedure in civil actions where an uncertain body were the defendants, but there was no law which forbade their liability if their funds could be reached. Another ground of complaint was set forth in a circular which the organised textile workers had sent to hon. Members. It was argued that the law affected masters and workmen unequally, that masters might close their works in order to influence disputes in other works, that they might black-list workmen and ruin them. [AN HON. MEMBER: But they do.] Perhaps so, but did the hon. Member think they ought? He did not think so, and therefore he could not assent to a Bill the second section of which would authorise the very thing which the textile workers resented, and which hon. Members opposite agreed was abominable and wicked. The hon. Member for Durham and the hon. Member for Clitheroe appeared to think that black-listing was indulged in, but he should like to hear of a case.

MR. JOHN WILSON said he remembered a case where three directors were brought to the Bar of the House for intimidating a witness, and they were reprimanded by the predecessor of the present Speaker. That was a concrete case.

*MR. DUKE said he regretted that the House had not a convenient prison for such persons. He agreed that such things should not be done, but he would point out that the second section of the Bill would authorise them. Hon. Members opposite contended that masters and men should be placed on an equal footing. Were the workers to be authorised to do wicked things because it was said that some employers did them? He would rather bring them both into a proper state of subordination to the law. If it were the fact that masters combined to damage workmen, such combination was as obnoxious to the principle laid down in "Quinn *v.* Leathem" as any of the acts reprehended in the judgment in that case. Let hon. Members consider the effect of the successive clauses in this Bill, and the object of them. The first clause of the Bill would override the principle laid down in "Lyons *v.* Wilkins," the second clause would override that laid down in "Quinn *v.* Leathem," and the third clause that in the Taff Vale case. "Lyons *v.* Wilkins" laid down the principle that an arbitrary power might not be assumed of closing a man's business because there was a trade dispute connected with his business. Many of them might say that when a man did what they disapproved that man's business ought to be stopped, and might withhold their custom and tell their friends of the fact, but to put in the hands of organised powers like the trades unions the authority at their will to stop the business of a malcontent employer would be to place the trades unions in a state of sovereignty which no king had ever enjoyed with the consent of the English people. [AN HON. MEMBER: The employers enjoy it.] Even if his seat in the House depended upon it, he would never allow anybody except the Legislature to close a man's business or prevent him from following his calling because in some dispute about methods of business or rules of labour they thought that man was wrong.

When picketing was spoken of by hon. Gentlemen and in the Bill as a right to attend for purposes of peaceable persuasion they used a mere form of words. The real question was whether it was to be in the power of a trade union to say to a malcontent workman, "You shall not work except upon our terms." All the talk about only two men attending at a time, or two men waiting on a pier for an Irish steamer, was beside the mark. He would remind hon. Members of Carlyle's example of the mode in which law operated. "The Judge says to a man, 'You shall be hanged.' He goes peacefully away and the executioner puts his hand upon him and he submits to death." That was because law prevailed. It was because of the wish that the edicts of trade unions, even benevolent, even useful edicts, should have the effect of law on men who were not their own members, that it was desired to picket their houses and that there should be attendance of people with authority to persuade them peacefully not to do what it was not thought by the unions that they should do. Peaceful persuasion was a powerful thing, but persuasion by the pacific exercise of power was a much greater thing; and it was the exercise of power which was sought to be legalised by the first section. He saw no mode of amending the section to bring it into harmony with what the law ought to be. The second section would simply legalise boycotting. He did not believe in boycotting in the sister island, and he did not believe in it here. As to the third clause, when twenty or thirty thousand pounds worth of damage was done by means unquestionably illegal, and by the organised action of a powerful trade union, it was a denial of justice and a preposterous proposition to say that only an agent who could pay a farthing in the pound could be sued. The great resources of a trade union could not be made available for the strengthening of the trade in its conflicts with employers and at the same time be protected from ill consequences of a wrong committed by the organisation. Trade unions ought not to be allowed to undertake great actions and wield great forces to give effect to them, with their great resources, without rendering those resources liable, when they were proved to be wrong, to be applied in remedying the wrong they had inflicted. He was sure that was a sound proposition. He could not see how this Bill would do what was sought to be done on the other side without legalising and sanctioning injustice. If hon. Members opposite simply wished to amend the law so that those who had the control of trade disputes should have a stronger inducement than they had now not to go beyond the proper scope of their authority he would heartily support any such measure. The Bill did nothing of the kind. Its tendency was in the opposite direction. Nor did the Bill seek to exclude sick and benefit funds from the area of conflict. The trades unions could themselves protect these funds if they desired to do so. It had been said that these funds, swelled as they were by the sick and benefit contributions, were the means of giving confidence to the trades unions. He believed they were, and if he were a trades unionist he should sympathise with the view of the hon. Member for Durham. But they could not expect to keep large funds available for fighting trade disputes, and then claim legal protection from any ill consequences which might occur. He had been reluctantly brought to the conclusion that he was bound to vote against the Bill, because it infringed the principle that every Englishman should dispose of his labour as well as his goods according to his will, subject to the control of the laws of the country.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Sir Thomas Wrightson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said he would endeavour to confine himself in the few observations he proposed to make to the remarks of his hon. and learned friend opposite, because on him had fallen the onus of dealing with what he might term the legal difficulties of the position. He recognised that it was conceded on both sides of the House that the condition of the law with regard to trade unions and combinations by workmen was unsatisfactory; in his judgment it was intolerable, and he thought he should be able to make perfectly clear his reasons for that conclusion. His hon. and learned friend started by saying that the Bill was so badly drawn that it was incapable of amendment. He himself was not prepared to defend the terms of the Bill. It was only fair and just that a Member who rose to speak in favour of a measure before the House should make perfectly clear his general views in relation thereto, and he conceived that in respect of particular provisions of this measure there was large scope for amendment. But that did not weigh on his mind in the vote that he should give. He should vote in favour of the Bill because, with all due deference to his hon. and learned friend opposite, he thought it could be amended. He saw no difficulty whatever in the Committee of the House or the Committee on Law dealing with the Bill on such lines as to render it conformable to the general principles of our law, and at the same time satisfy the legitimate grievances of trades unionists.

It was a strong expression to say that the state of the law as it at present stood was intolerable, but he thought he could substantiate that. The position of trades unions, having regard to recent decisions, was worse than it was before the Act of 1871. Before that Act was passed a trade union was what might be termed an outlaw. Its members were liable to prosecution for engaging in a criminal conspiracy. It had no right to sue and no right to be sued. They could not make it answerable in its funds; in other words, it was not recognised in a Court of justice, except in so far as its members could be proceeded against criminally. That was the state of the law before 1870. The Legislature then came in and passed a statute whereby it said, "We legalise you; you shall be permitted to possess and administer funds; you shall be permitted to bring and sustain actions to protect your funds; and, apart from that, certain things which you do in combination or restraint of trade shall not be illegal." Under that statute trade unions for a considerable time, without let or hindrance from the Judicature of the country, except when and in so far as they transgressed the criminal law, proceeded to carry out their legitimate combinations in restraint of trade. Then, at a late stage in the history of trades unions, the civil courts, invoked by the employers, stepped in and said, "You, trade unions, shall be responsible in your funds for the wrongful acts of your agents." His hon. and learned friend the Member for Plymouth said, "Why should not a trade union be responsible in respect of its acts, exactly like any other organisation." His answer was that a trade union was, in itself, an anomaly so far as the law of the country was concerned. The law said, "You are an illegal combination; but we will make you a legal combination." Then the Courts of justice stepped in and prevented this combination, legalised by Act of Parliament, from carrying out its operations in the only way in which a trade union could carry out its operations. That was his answer to his hon. and learned friend; and he pressed this upon the Attorney-General. They did not ask, as his hon. and learned friend had suggested, that trade unions should enjoy absolute immunity. What they did ask was that, inasmuch as they could only carry on their operations in restraint of trade by the combined action of their members in withdrawing their members from employment, and so bringing pressure to bear on the employers of labour, they should not be responsible if they did not, by their authoritative councils or governing bodies, authorise or ratify illegal acts. That was not, he agreed, in the Bill as it stood. But they were voting on a general principle or proposition which could be brought into line in Committee with what the trade unions desired. He concurred with his hon. and learned friend that the Bill went further than that, but in Committee it could be limited as he had suggested, so that trade unions should be liable for wrongful acts when they expressly authorised these wrongful acts.

His hon. and learned friend went on to deal with the case as put by the decision in "Lyons *v.* Wilkins." What "Lyons *v.* Wilkins" decided was that it was not lawful for members of a trade union to attend at or near a place of employment in order to persuade workmen to give their legal notice, or to persuade persons who proposed to become workmen from entering into employment. Now, he contended, there was nothing illegal in advising a man not to enter into a contract; and neither was there anything illegal in advising a man to terminate a contract by legal notice. He thought everybody in that House must agree to that proposition. His hon. friend said that that was coercion; that that was stopping a man from carrying on his business. It was nothing of the kind. It was no more stopping an employer from carrying on his business than certain shipowners stopped others from carrying on their business in the Mogul case. What the workman did, in the case of "Lyons *v.* Wilkins," was what the workman was clearly entitled to do in his own interests, and what the trade union was entitled to do in the interest of its members. What the trade union said was, "We advise you not to enter into a certain employment, or to leave it at the termination of the legal notice." The immediate purpose was not to stop a business, but to help the workmen, and that was perfectly legitimate.

MR. DUKE said that the deciding question in that case was whether the object of the trade union was to stop a man's business.

*MR. ATHERLEY-JONES begged his hon. friend's pardon. The decision in that case was founded on this—although there were *dicta* of the Judges on other points—that picketing under the statute was only protected for the purpose of "communicating" and "obtaining" information; and it was because, in that case, that had been exceeded—in other words, the men had given advice—that the decision was given. So long as picketing was confined to communicating information it was legal. Mr. Justice Stirling, in the Charnock case, decided that "picketing" could only be legal if confined to obtaining and communicating information. Now what did they, the promoters of this Bill, ask? They asked that it should be lawful for a workman or a trade union or a number of workmen to advise people to do something in their own interest which did not involve the perpetration of a wrong on another person. Why should that not be permissible? They said, and said justly, with all due deference to the Judges who had decided the case alluded to, that those Judges did, to a certain extent, press the law against the trade unions in a way that they should not have done, and which had not been done in other cases of a cognate character but not affecting trade unions. His hon. and learned friend said that that would result in violence; but he was sure that the promoters of the Bill were perfectly free to consider words which would prevent any tumultuous assembly—that was to say, that there should not be a larger number than three or four persons attending at the place of business. As had already been pointed out, it was perfectly competent for the law at present to stop a tumultuous assembly. But here was a case with which his hon. and learned friend had never dealt. At Fleetwood two or three workmen attended at a landing stage to persuade other workmen not to enter into a contract with certain employers; and a Court of law held that that was illegal. He asked the Attorney-General whether that decision could be justified on the lines taken by his hon. and learned friend. Those who were in favour of the Bill under discussion did not wish to impinge in the smallest degree on the decision in the case "Quinn *v.* Leathem." All they wanted to say was that it was monstrous and intolerable that a trade union should be held responsible for some foolish, inconsiderate, or malicious action on the part of an unauthorised member.

After the decision of the House of Lords in the Taff Vale case, everybody connected with trade unions believed that the position of trade unions was far more perilous than it had been for the last thirty years. If the present position held, it was impossible for a trade union, as such, to use the only means in its hands to bring legitimate pressure to bear upon an employer by persuading workmen to terminate their employment or not to enter into employment. The promoters of the Bill contended that such action was, in the spirit of the law of the land, perfectly legitimate and justifiable, and, therefore, with some modifying words, they were in favour of a measure on those lines. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment that the Bill should be read a second time six months hence said that a Royal Commission was sitting on this subject. But how long was that Commission going to sit? The question specially dealt with in the Bill before the House was absolutely familiar to every lawyer in the House, and one which the Attorney-General knew root and branch. Were they to wait for legislation on a matter jeopardising the funds of trade unions until they had the decision of a Commission which did not enjoy the sympathy and confidence of the working clasess? He submitted that they were entitled to receive from the Government an authoritative declaration as to what course they proposed to take to remedy a state of things which he had no hesitation in saying was intolerable.

*MR. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth) said he had to confess that he could not controvert the legal arguments of the hon. Gentleman who had seconded the Motion, but he quite agreed with the mover that this was a question which required to be settled. For years past he had voted in favour of some such settlement as was provided in the Bill now before the House. He had had considerable experience in the operations of trade unions, and he must confess that he had found, by endeavouring to work in sympathy with them, that employers of labour derived very great advantage from them. By means of trade unions questions which seemed almost incapable of solution had been satisfactorily settled and great economies effected in the carrying on of large industrial concerns. A very large proportion of the industrial population believed rightly or wrongly that they had been placed in an intolerable position by the Taff Vale decision, and he felt that some steps should be taken towards making an effectual and effective settlement of the questions in dispute. He regretted greatly that the trade unions did not see their way to fall in with the proceedings of the Royal Commission; but that was all the more reason why Parliament should not disregard the wishes of a large proportion of the industrial population of the country. He supported the Bill on general grounds, without regard to details, as for instance on peaceful picketing. If the suggestion of the Member for North West Durham were adopted to limit the picket to two or three persons——

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES: Yes.

MR. RANDLES: This would meet a great objection to the Bill. He believed that legislation would do no violence to the interests of the employers, and would promote permanent good will and peace, upon which the country's prosperity depended, among all classes of the community. He would vote for the Second Reading.

*SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston) said it was with very great regret that he found the Bill framed in such a way that he did not feel himself able to give it his support. He had a great many trade unionists in his constituency, and they had pressed him very much to support the Bill. He wished that he could have done so; but the reason why he could not give his consent to the Second Reading was the extent of the powers conferred by Clause 1 on persons concerned in a labour dispute. He was very desirous of seeing all proper powers given to trade unionists to enable them to carry on the work which, within limits, had been most beneficial to the workers of the country; but he was not prepared to put trade unions and still less unauthorised groups of persons above the law, and that was distinctly what Clause 1 did, especially if it were read in connection with Clause 3. Trade unions and even unorganised bodies were, simply because they contemplated a dispute, to have privileges which the law did not allow to private individuals. It was proposed that because a trade dispute was in contemplation or in progress, certain other persons should be deprived of the ordinary protection of the law of the land and of his remedy for what was described in law as a nuisance. A man might find his house surrounded by a crowd; and when he called on the police he would be informed that the police could not interfere because a trade dispute was in contemplation or in progress. Here they were face to face with a provision not for improving the condition of the employed, but for diminishing the ordinary liberty of the individual. Therefore, he could not vote for the Second Reading of the Bill.

He wished the Report of the Royal Commission had been published, and he also wished that the Commission had been differently constituted, because he agreed that there were great legal and practical difficulties connected with the administration of the law in its present state. He wished the House could have some authoritative statement which would enable it to deal with what the hon. Member for Mid.-Durham admitted was a very difficult and intricate matter. He would suggest that a possible mode of dealing with the Bill would be to refer it to some Committee which could ascertain the facts; then they would have a better chance of legislating so as to meet the present difficulty and give satisfaction all round. He did not think it was much in the interest of workmen generally that groups or bodies of persons should be allowed to organise picketing altogether relieved from responsibility for their acts. The House ought to be careful how it interfered with trade at the present time. Trade was not too prosperous. He himself felt appalled at the increase in the number of the unemployed; and he could not help feeling that it was partly due to ill-considered demands on the part of workmen which tended to drive industries into foreign countries. Capital and the brains to carry on business were now very cosmopolitan. If there was an opening in this country for men of capital or genius, then business would come here; but if they imposed unnecessary difficulties capital and genius would fly to other countries. Therefore, they ought to be very careful regarding the regulations and alterations they made in matters connected with the trade and industry of the country. He quite agreed that they had much to gain by well regulated trade unions; but if the law were extended so as to enable unauthorised and unregulated persons to interfere with the course of trade the result might be to drive into other countries commercial undertakings which this country would otherwise retain with great advantage to all concerned.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said he would only trespass on the time of the House for a few minutes, because the arguments for the Second Reading had been so ably stated in the admirable speech of his hon. friend the Member for the Spen Valley, that it was impossible to develop them without danger of repetition. Speaking for himself and all those on the bench behind him, he wished to say that they would cordially support the Second Reading. Every speaker, so far as he could ascertain, had paid a dialectical homage to the principle of combination. They were all agreed now, whatever might have been the case thirty or fifty years ago, that the right of combination on the part of workmen, which used to be regarded as a dangerous or revolutionary licence, was essential to the due regulation of the trade of the country and to a system of equitable relations between labour and capital. When they looked back on the state of things which prevailed before the legalisation of trade unions and compared it with the state of things which happily existed to-day, he thought it did not admit of argument that there had been, in the first place, a great diminution in the number, and, secondly, a great civilising and humanising in the methods of industrial conflicts. What was more important than either, while they had through the recognition of what was called collective bargaining much greater security for the economic liberty of the workman than could have been possible when he was left as a mere isolated individual to make his own contract with his employer, they had at the same time introduced by a recognition of the practice of combination a sense of responsibility and of statesmanship in the conduct of industrial relations which was of equal value to employer and employed.

For two reasons it appeared to him that legislation was now not only expedient but necessary. They were both founded upon the same set of facts —namely, the recent course of judicial decisions. He would remind the House of what was said by two of the most eminent lawyers this country had ever known, who happened to sit on opposite sides in politics—the late Lord Cairns and the late Sir George Jessel—when the Bills of 1871 and 1875 were under the consideration of Parliament. Lord Cairns, speaking in the House of Lords, said that the principle on which the Bill was framed was that offences in relation to trade disputes should be thoroughly known and understood and that the trade unions should not be subjected to the intricate and deluding action of the law of conspiracy. Sir George Jessel, speaking in the House of Commons, said that if they simply abolished combinations and left the matter to be dealt with by the common law, they would transfer that accurate definition of crime which ought to be the province of legislation to the judges, and they would leave a whole class in utter uncertainty as to what their duties and obligations were. The working classes wished to see offences, whatever they might be, accurately defined. Founding himself on those two statements of two great lawyers, he ventured to say that the very evil which they both contemplated and deprecated was the evil from which we were suffering now in consequence of these recent decisions. The law which Parliament intended was now interpreted in a totally different sense—he would not say wrongly, for of course he bowed with the utmost deference to the decisions of the highest tribunals of the country—from that which was intended by the judges of the day. He thought he might fairly appeal to his hon. and learned friends, on whichever side they sat, to say whether, even at this moment, if they had to pass a carefully set examination in the application of the law of conspiracy and the law of agency to trade disputes there was any one of them who would feel any confidence that he would pass. Certainly, for himself, he professed his complete inability to reconcile by any form of language he could devise, however vague and elastic, the conflicting and warring *dicta* of the judges of the land. That was the first reason.

The second reason for legislation was equally cogent. It was that, whatever they might think of the justice or the injustice of these decisions as interpreting the intentions of the Legislature or the meaning of the common law, undoubtedly they had had the effect, and would have the effect, of seriously encroaching on the legitimate exercise of the right of combination. Take only one case, that of "Lyons *v.* Wilkins." There was no doubt that it had enormously circumscribed what everybody had hitherto regarded as the natural and normal activity of trade combination in *bona fide* industrial disputes. Therefore on both grounds it appeared to him that the time had come when, without waiting for the Report of the Royal Commission, because this Bill only dealt in a modest way with one branch of the matter, the House of Commons might properly be asked to initiate legislation to deal with a pressing grievance.

What were the provisions of the Bill? The first clause affected the limits within which the practice of picketing should be legitimate. He was not using a language of exaggeration when he said that if such a decision as that in "Lyons *v.* Wilkins" was carried into effect it rendered picketing a perfectly nugatory and impossible industrial weapon. He was not going to defend abuses. He was quite sensible of the danger there was, when picketing was resorted to, of its degenerating from a legitimate weapon into something in the nature of coercion. No trade unionist he had come across failed to recognise that there was a boundary line between that which was legitimate and that which was illegitimate, and no one who was responsible for the framing of the Bill wished, either directly or indirectly, to give any countenance to the exercise of intimidation or coercion; but undoubtedly the effect of the construction put on the Act of 1875 was that unless picketing was used for the purpose for which he ventured to say it never could be exclusively used—for the purpose merely of communication—it became absolutely illegitimate and the foundation for a civil action. Human nature being what it was and social customs being what they were, it was difficult to suppose that when a workman or a couple of workmen were delegated by a trade union to perform this function during a strike, they could ever confine themselves to the communication of information only. Why should they? Why should they not have the power, without violating the law, and without exposing themselves, or, what was more important, the funds of their union, to civil proceedings—why should they not have the power of peaceable and legitimate persuasion? It was absolutely pedantic to say that any human being, constituted as he was, in a matter in which he was seriously interested and in which he was endeavouring to bring about a certain result, was to be confined to the bare communication of facts and not to be allowed to draw inferences from them unless he was prepared to face an action at law. Unless they were prepared to prohibit picketing altogether they must allow the legitimate exercise of the right of picketing to include, not merely the communication of information, but also peaceful persuasion.

The second clause of the Bill provided that—

> "An agreement or combination by two or more persons to do or procure to be done any act in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute shall not be ground for an action if such act when committed by one person would not be ground for an action."

What was the objection to that? He did not know what it was. Did the House realise that in 1875 the Legislature provided that such an agreement should not be punishable as a criminal conspiracy if the act was committed by one person? This clause only sought to remove the liability to civil procedure where the Legislature removed the liability to criminal proceedings thirty years ago. It might be said this was a mere academic change. It was not anything of the kind. This additional protection was required in order really to carry out what was, undoubtedly, the intention of the Legislature in 1875.

There only remained the third clause, which provided for the protection of trade union funds. He entirely agreed with the purpose of the clause, but he was not satisfied that this was the best mode of accomplishing it. Until the decision of the House of Lords, in what was called the Taff Vale case, no human being ever thought the funds of trade unions could be made liable in this way. He believed it was the intention of the Legislature in 1871, and again in 1875, that the funds of trade unions should not be made liable for any such purpose. If they had had the intention to make them liable the simplest way of giving legislative effect to it would have been to have incorporated it in the Acts; but the Legislature refrained from doing so. The real evil to be guarded against, which had been accentuated and intensified by this decision of the House of Lords, was that the funds of a union might be made liable for the acts of persons who were really irresponsible agents, though their agency might be attributed to the union. If they could once get such a limitation of the law of agency as would protect the union, and, therefore, its funds, from the acts of those who were not definitely authorised to bind it, he believed the result of the decision in the Taff Vale case would almost entirely disappear. What was the best mode of arriving at this result was pre-eminently a matter for discussion in Committee; but there was no reason whatever, although he disagreed with the mode proposed, why he should refuse his assent to the Second Reading of this clause as well as of the rest of the Bill. He had now explained to the House why it was that, taking the Bill as a whole, he heartily supported the Second Reading. With reference to what fell from the hon. Baronet opposite, he should strongly deprecate referring the Bill to a Select Committee with the object of taking evidence. There was no new evidence to be taken. All the principles which ought to determine the way in which they should deal with the facts were known, and ought to be either accepted or rejected; and to refer the Bill to a Select Committee would be nothing more nor less than to consign it to slow and certain death.

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON said he had no intention of that kind. He only desired that all the facts should be clearly ascertained.

MR. ASQUITH said he did not impute any such intention to the hon. Gentleman, but that would be the effect of his proposal. That there were difficulties no one would dispute; but what were the new facts to be ascertained? What he would suggest, and he hoped the suggestion would be accepted by the Government and the great majority of hon. Gentlemen, was that the House should give the Bill a Second Reading, and that it should then be referred to one of the Standing Committees, which would be the proper tribunal when they were dealing with a measure which was not a matter of Party controversy, the general principle of which the vast majority of the House favoured and which required that adequate and more or less informal discussion which was to be got in a Committee upstairs better than on the floor of the House. He earnestly hoped the House would give a unanimous vote in favour of the Second Reading.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that one of the most gratifying features of the debate had been the recognition by Members on both sides of the House of the great and good work done by trade unions. The hon. Member or Mid.-Durham and his hon. friend the Member for St. Pancras both agreed in stating most emphatically that they regarded the relations between masters and men as having been substantially improved by the stability and prosperity of the trade unions. If that was agreed in all parts of the House, he thought he might say that this debate had not been thrown away.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife had said that in former days combinations were unduly restrained. He fully agreed with that; but he thought they should take care that, while in former days combinations of workmen were inequitably suppressed, they did not rush into the opposite extreme and exempt such combinations from the operation of the general law of the country. The right hon. Gentleman had said that there was difficulty and obscurity about the law, and he suggested that hon. Members would find difficulty in passing an examination in it. He agreed that the views of examiners on points of that kind might differ; but he did not think that his right hon. friend and he, if they talked the matter over properly, would very much differ as to what the law was. He was unable to concur with the view so generally expressed that there was such great confusion in this branch of the law. With that view, in 1903 a strong Royal Commission had been appointed, the head of which was the present Lord Justice General, then the Secretary for Scotland, and which was otherwise composed of Mr. Cohen, K.C., Sir Godfrey Lushington, Sir William Lewis, and Mr. Sidney Webb. It had been hoped that Mr. Webb would have been accepted as entirely representing the views of those who were interested in labour questions

[" No "]—well, the Government had had some reason for expecting that he would —but it turned out that the trade unions did not recognise the composition of this Commission as satisfactory to themselves. History sometimes repeated itself. The trade unions resolved not to give their assistance to the Commission which sat in 1874; and if that Commission had ceased when the trade unions declined to give assistance the country would have been the poorer by a most admirable Report and the legislation which ensued. The present Commission had concluded their hearing of the evidence. They were now engaged on the work of preparing their Report, which he hoped might be in their possession by the month of May next. Surely if it were the case, as had been so emphatically stated on the other side, and by none more emphatically than by his right hon. friend the Member for East Fife, that the law was in confusion and wanted clearing up, it was in the last degree rash to rush into legislation without waiting to see what so very strong a Commission was able to report on it.

He cordially joined in the compliments which had been paid to the speech of the hon. Member for Spen Valley, who had moved the Second Reading of this Bill. He listened to that speech with the deepest interest—and to no part of it with more interest than that dealing with Clause 3, which purported to do away with the Taff Vale decision. That clause was far more important than the other two put together, and if it were carried the trade unions might feel that they had effectively got everything they wanted. The hon. Member, in approaching that clause, admitted that *prima facie* it seemed an unreasonable thing to confer on trade unions an exemption which was not enjoyed by any other body of men in the United Kingdom. The reasonableness of that remark must be apparent to every one on both sides of the House. The reason the hon. Member gave for adopting the clause, notwithstanding its apparent unreasonableness, was one of the strangest reasons he had ever heard. It was that, even if this were legislation of an objectionable character, in former days there had been class legislation in the interests of the employer. He dared say there had been; but was that any reason for having class legislation in the interest of the labourer?

*Mr. WHITTAKER said that he did not give this as a reason for supporting this particular clause. He was then speaking of the Bill as a whole and dealing with the argument of those who said they objected to special legislation for labour. His suggestion was that that came very strangely from those in whose interest there had been so much special legislation in the past.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY thought that, on referring to the reports of his speech, the hon. Member would see that he made the observation with regard to the third clause, and as a reason for adopting a proposal which seemed unreasonable. Was it, or was it not, unreasonable? A wrongful act was done by the directors of a powerful body. The immediate agents in doing that wrongful act were workmen who could not pay any damages to the persons injured; and the proposal was that the body which directed the doing of that act should be exempted from all liability; and they were actually told that the person injured ought to be satisfied with the liability of the individual workmen, who were simply the agents of an association. He submitted that the misgivings which the hon. Member for Spen Valley evidently felt when he was attempting to convince the House were amply justified, and he was not surprised that not even his ability was able to drive away the gloomy doubts which had risen in his mind. One of the most valuable contributions to the debate was the statement of the hon. Member for Mid.-Durham that he did not object to a trade union being made liable for any wrongful act the commission of which it had authorised. That was the state of the law at present.

*Mr. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.) said he thought where an unlawful act had been committed, if the executive committee of a trade organisation or the general council gave the instructions, there was no reason why they should not be held responsible.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he had known the hon. Member for many years, and what he had said now was in keeping with everything he had known of him. That was not, however, in this third clause, and he trusted the hon. Member would individually feel it to be his duty to vote against that clause.

*MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid.) said he thought the law as it was interpreted would make a union responsible for the acts of an irresponsible person.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No; the third clause, about which he feared there was some misconception, was—

> "An action shall not be brought against a trade union or other association aforesaid for the recovery of damage sustained by any person or persons by reason of the action of a member or members of such trade union or other association aforesaid."

If that clause passed it would exempt a trade union from liability for the acts which the members of the association had authorised. [Cries of "No."] There was not a lawyer in the House who would get up and say that was not the effect of the clause. He noticed an expression of emphatic assent to that statement from those capable of forming an opinion. The object of this clause was to exempt trade unions from the operation of what was the law of the land. Was that a reasonable proposal? The hon. Member for Mid.-Durham seemed to think that legislation would be required to exempt trade unions from liability for an act which they had not authorised. No such legislation was required. The liability of a trade union proceeded entirely from the fact that the act complained of was done by their authority. Last year a case was quoted, he thought by his hon. and learned friend the Member for Dumfries, in which the Judge of first instance had held that the trade union was not liable. It was taken to the Court of Appeal, and the Court of Appeal held that the trade union was liable on the ground that there was sufficient evidence that the trade union had authorised the act that was complained of. A case was decided the other day—the case of "Airey *v.* Weighill"—where the Court of Appeal decided, on February 10th, as reported in *The Times* of February 11th, that the trade union in that particular case was not liable because they did not authorise the act which was complained of. He would read the concluding sentence of the judgment of the Master of the Rolls—

> "The plaintiff had failed to satisfy the burden which lay upon him of showing any authority either of the lodge or of the union. The application would, therefore, be allowed, and judgment entered for the union."

That was simply the general law of the land.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES said that was the act of a lodge official. Would the union have been liable or not if the act had been committed by a principal officer of the union?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said it was no use entangling the House in details as to particular cases. The broad principle was perfectly clear that the union was not liable unless the act was done by its authority. Of course the authority of a trades union, like that of any corporation, might be derived in various ways, by express resolution, by the rules authorising some act to be done, by word of mouth from the governing body, or there might be circumstances giving a clear indication that the union in fact authorised the act to be done. What was this substituted proposal which was hinted at by his right hon. and learned friend the Member for East Fife? He said he could not support the clause as it stood, but would look forward to amending it in Committee, by showing that it would apply only to an act not authorised by the trade union. It was proposed to alter the present law and enact that a trade union should not be liable unless a resolution in terms authorised the act complained of. It was perfectly manifest that would be introducing an exemption in favour of a trade union that did not exist in regard to any other body. What would be the result? There never would be a resolution; everything would be done by word of mouth, and the association would enjoy an entire immunity because authority had not been given by resolution. He confessed that after hearing the subject discussed on three or four occasions in the House of Commons he had never been able to understand why trade unions had not adopted a simple and effective remedy which lay in their hands, that of separating the fund used for fighting purposes from the fund available for sick pay and provident purposes. They did not do this, and year after year the House was asked to remove a grievance which, so far as it existed, was created wholly by refusal to adopt a course which would remove that grievance.

He had dealt with the third clause first because it was the most important clause in the Bill, and before he left it he desired to make one other observation with regard to it. It had been said again and again that it was the clear intention of the Legislature in 1871 that trade unions should not be liable, but he ventured to say that hon. Members might read the debates upon that measure from end to end without finding a single expression that sustained that view. There were many references to preventing actions, but those actions were by members against societies or societies against members. But there was nothing in the Act, nor so far as he could find in the debates upon the Bill before it became law, which tended to show that that was the intention of those who were responsible for the passing of that Act. He was contrained, therefore, to enter a word of protest against the statement continually made in this discussion that the decision in the Taff Vale case was in distinct violation of the expressed intention of the Act.

MR. ASQUITH said it was not expressed.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he had no intuition in the matter; he could only get at the intention from what was said.

The second clause of the Bill came next in point of importance after the third. The first clause was of some importance, the second of more importance, and the third of capital importance. The second clause was as follows—

> "An agreement or combination by two or more persons to do or procure to be done any act in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute shall not be ground for an action, if such act when committed by one person would not be ground for an action."

In support of that clause it was said that parties in the case of trade disputes were exempted from criminal proceedings for conspiracy by combination, and that was true; but he failed to see, if a wrong was done to an individual by parties entering into combination, why, if there appeared ground for action at common law, the aggrieved person should be deprived of the means of redress. He could not help thinking that what had been said was perfectly true, that the clause, if passed, would be used for such purposes as those which caused an Irish name to become almost a household word throughout the country; it would legalise what was known as "boycotting," a practice which had been generally reprobated. He earnestly asked the House to consider whether it was desirable to move in this direction in reference to combinations. Was it not matter for very serious consideration, in view of the formation of those great commercial combinations known as trusts, whether the movement should not be rather in the other direction? If the clause should be passed because it would help trade unions, it might operate in a manner trade unionists would not like in favour of employers. This was a point hon. Members interested in labour matters should consider. He recognised the justice of everything that had been said as to the assistance the House derived from the presence of Labour representatives, but he asked them seriously to consider whether it might not be a little short-sighted and to their disadvantage to run a risk of this kind.

The first clause the hon. Member for Spen Valley dealt with with great ability, but his earnest appeal to the House was not really in support of the clause, it was upon a totally different matter. In the Act of 1875 there was an exemption from the criminal liability that was imposed for various acts, among others "watching and besetting," when such was for the purpose of obtaining or communicating information, and if the proposal in the Bill had been merely to insert the words "or for peaceable persuasion" the hon. Member could have made out a very strong case indeed in favour of his contention.; but that was not the proposal or anything like it. Peaceful persuasion in itself did not incur any liability. The question which arose here was whether in any case arising out of that "peaceful persuasion." which the Act of 1875 called "watching and besetting," the right of action given where premises were watched and beset should be taken away. It was forgotten that in the case "Lyons *v.* Wilkins" it was contended that there was a nuisance at common law. But this clause would legalise watching and besetting, even though it amounted to a nuisance. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries shook his head, but he had been doing that for three years. When this effect of the clause had been pointed out, why was it year after year introduced in the same form?

SIR ROBERT REID said he really did not think it mattered.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY asked why it was not made clear. He had a strong impression that, if the hon. and learned Gentleman expressed the view that there should be no exemption from liability if the watching amounted to a nuisance, his colleagues would not accept it. He could not understand the idea of bringing a clause in the same form year after year unless there was something in the particular form. He had not concealed from the House his personal view, and he should vote against the Bill; but at the same time recognising that, as the Prime Minister said last year, a practice had grown up of regarding the Second Reading of private Bills as more in the nature of an abstract Resolution which had the support of hon. Members than as a stage in legislation. Hon. Members on that side who found themselves able to do so might if they pleased vote for the Second Reading; but personally he should vote against it. He hoped that the desirability of legislation proceeding on the Report of the Royal Commission which was appointed in June, 1904, might be recognised. What hon. Gentlemen opposite wanted was a definition of the law. They said the law was difficult to understand and they wanted it clearly stated. But this Bill did not propose clearly to state the law. It did nothing of the kind. It did not define the law; it was a measure to put trade unions above the law. The first clause, as he read it, would exempt them from the common law of nuisance; the second clause would exempt them from the common law of conspiracy; and the third clause would exempt them from the liability of action which every other person and corporation in the United Kingdom was exposed to. He desired to see trade unions go on and prosper, but he did not desire that they should enjoy the great authority which this Bill would confer upon them.

Mr. WHITTAKER rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

*MR. SPEAKER: As this Bill has passed the Second Reading after discussion on a previous occasion in the present Parliament, and has now been discussed again, I think the hon. Member is entitled to have an opportunity of ascertaining whether the House now approves of it, and is disposed to send it to a Standing or other Committee as suggested.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided; Ayes, 244; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 38.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Sir Francis T(Windsor)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duke, Henry Edward
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fisher, William Hayes

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, JF (Sheffield, Brightside)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Jones, DavidBrynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John

M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hn. John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Randles, John S.
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Thomas(WMonm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)

Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn. CR. (Northants.)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomas, JA(Glamorgan, Gower)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Webb, Colonel William George
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley George (York, W.R.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton undLyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wills, Arthur Walters (NDorset
Wills, Sir Frederick (Bristol, N.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr Herbert Gladstone and Mr Causton.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. SirMichaelHicks

Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Campbell, Rt. HnJ.A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Ed. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dewar, SirTR. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon

Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.Sir J.(Man'cr.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS(Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit William,
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J E(Elgin &Nairn)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene,Sir EW (B'rySEdm'nds
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hn. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'ndnd'ry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, Sir J. (Staffords. N. W.
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn. Col.W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence,SirJoseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,John Grant (Yorks.NR
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.- Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield.)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G. (Oxf'dUniv
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Wrightson and Sir Frederick Banbury.

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question." The House divided:—Ayes, 248; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 39.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlayne, T. S'thampton
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,CaptE.C(SAndrew'sBghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardie, J. Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayden, John Patrick

Hayter, Rt. Hn Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E.H.(Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W
Kenyon, Hon. Geo T. (Denbigh
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton Hn. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Randles John S.
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Thomas(W Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, HerbertL. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt. HnCR (Northants.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomas, JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Webb, Colonel William George
Weir,James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whiteley,H.(Ashton undLyne)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills,ArthurWalters(N Dorset
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse,SirJT. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whittaker and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex.F
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon. Sir H
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn. A.J.(Manch'r.
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach,Rt.Hn.Sir Michael Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Harry
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson,Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt. Hn.J.A.(Wor.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John CR.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H.Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett,T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dewar, SirT.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn. Sir J.(Manc.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, Sir James (Staffords, NW
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hn.-James Henry Cecil
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks, N.R
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Peel, Hn. Wm. R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Sir Frederick (Bristol, N
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Wrightson and Mr. Duke.

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 252 ; Noes, 130. (Division List No. 40.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hon. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt. E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christoper
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Guest, Hon, Ivor Churchill

Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardie,J Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Harmsworth, R. Liecester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter,Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,DavidBrynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P(Cavan,W.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kilbride, Denis
Knowles, Sir Lees
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil

Mitchell, Edw. Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, RtHon.John(Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Randles, John S.
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R.Threshie (Dumfries
Richards,Thomas(W Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)

Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sinclair Louis (Romford)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R (Northants
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomas,JA(Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph, (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Webb, Colonel William George
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills,Arthur Walters(N Dorset
Wilson, J. W (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse,Sir JT (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whittaker and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Capt.Sir Alex.F.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach,Rt.Hn.Sir MichaelHicks

Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole

Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dewar,Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (Bury St Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Heath, Sir James (Staffords., N W
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks N. R)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead.
Legge, Col. Hon. Henage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
Maxwell, W J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morton, Arthur H. Alymer
Nicholson, William Graham
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Sir Frederick (Bristol, N.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W H (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E R (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Thomas Wrightson and
Mr. Duke.

Bill read a second time.

MR. WHITTAKER moved the committal of the Bill to the Standing Committee on Law.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. Whittaker.*)

*SIR THOMAS WRIGHTSON moved to substitute "a Select Committee of Fifteen Members" for "the Standing Committee on Law."

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'the Standing Committee on Law, etc.,' and insert the words 'a Select Committee of Fifteen Members.'"—(*Sir Thomas Wrightson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that as a member of the Chairman's Panel he wished to express his doubt whether this was a Bill which ought to be referred to a Standing Committee. These Committees were intended to facilitate the passage of Bills which were practically agreed in principle, but the details of which required careful consideration. The Aliens Bill of last session was referred to a Grand Committee, but no progress could be made with it, and it had eventually to be withdrawn. Other instances could be quoted in which Bills evoking strong opposition had been referred to a Standing Committees with equally unsatisfactory results. He was afraid the Grand Committees would break down or fail in their usefulness should Bills of a controversial character be referred to them, and he earnestly advised the House not to refer this Bill in the manner proposed.

Mr. HARDY (Kent, Ashford) expressed his surprise that, after the protests made on the other side of the House last session with regard to the Aliens Bill, it should now be proposed to refer this Bill to a Standing Committee. He did not believe that any Chairman of a Grand Commtttee would say that this was a measure which ought to be so referred. It was a much more contentious Bill than the Aliens Bill. Referring to another measure last year, when objecting to its committal to a Grand Committee, the Leader of the Opposition said that not only was it bitterly opposed and resented by a large body of Members but it also introduced a new constitutional practice and principle. Those words applied very aptly to the present measure, and he hoped the House would support the Amendment.

Colonel PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said the course of the debate had shown that there was very little agreement in any part of the House with reference to this Bill. Not only had a larger number voted against it than voted against the Aliens Bill, but no two speakers had agreed as to any one clause. The mover admitted that the matter was one of great difficulty; the hon. Member for Mid.-Durham was not satisfied with the picketing clauses; the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife disagreed with previous speeches.

Mr. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) rising to a point of order, asked whether the hon. Member was entitled to make a Second Reading speech on this Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was not entitled, under guise of showing that this was a contentious measure, to discuss all the different opinions which had been expressed in the debate. He was entitled to argue that as the debate had shown differences of opinion, the Bill ought not to go to a Grand Committee, but he would not be in order in examining the individual arguments used.

Colonel PILKINGTON wished to argue that a Select Committee was a more competent body than a Grand Committee to deal with this Bill. Much more information was required before the Bill could be properly dealt with, and that information could be given better before a Select Committee than before the Grand Committee on Law. There was no hurry about the matter, and he submitted that the existing confusion of mind and division of opinion could be best sifted by a Select Committee.

Question put.

House divided:—Ayes, 247; Noes, 142. (Division List No. 41.)

AYES.

Abraham, William(Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvil, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, RtHn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helder, Augustus
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Mitchell, Edw. Fermanagh, N.
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
O Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O Connor, T. P. (Liverpool
O Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Pirie, Duncan, V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Randles, John S.
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Webb, Col. Wm. George
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters(N.Dorset
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Woodhouse, SirJ T.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Whittaker and Mr.
John Wilson (Durham).

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Capt.Sir Alex.F.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Barry,Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Beach,Rt.Hn SirMichael Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A (Glasgow
Carson, R. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim,S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hn. Sir JosephC.
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dorington,Rt. Hn. Sir JohnE.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,Sir R.B.(Inv'rn'ssB'ghs
Fison, Frederick William
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,Sir EW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, R. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG.(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Heath SirJames(Staffords.NW
Henderson,Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn.Col.W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks,N.R
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Nicholson, William Graham
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart Sir H.(Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Talbot, Rt Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills,Sir Frederick (Bristol,N.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Thomas Wrightson and
Sir Frederick Banbury.

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Five of the clock, and objection being taken to further proceeding, Mr. Speaker proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. WHITTAKER rose in his place, and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

Question proposed, "That the Question be now put."

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) pointed out that the hon. Member did not claim the Main Question until after Mr. Speaker had put the Question from the Chair.

*MR. SPEAKER said he put the Question from the Chair and if no one had objected it would have gone through. But as an hon. Member rose to continue the debate I was about to interrupt the business, and the closure could be moved.

Question put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES' OFFICERS.

Bill to extend the provisions of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, 1896, to the Officers of urban district councils, and to give such Officers a right of appeal in certain events, ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Leese, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Bathurst, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Bigwood, Mr. Griffith Boscawen, Mr. Robert Cameron, Mr. Cox, Mr. David John Morgan, and Mr. Newdigate.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES' OFFICERS BILL.

"To extend the provisions of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, 1896, to the Officers of urban district councils, and to give such Officers a right of appeal in certain events," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 94.]

EDUCATION AUTHORITIES (ACCESS TO BOOKS AND DOCUMENTS).

Bill to enable ratepayers to inspect Books and Documents of local Education Authorities, ordered to be brought in by Sir Albert Rollit, Dr. Macnamara, Sir George Fardell, Mr. Lough, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Mr. Bousfield, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Moon, and Mr. Forde Ridley.

EDUCATION AUTHORITIES (ACCESS TO BOOKS AND DOCUMENTS) BILL.

"To enable ratepayers to inspect Books and Documents of local Education Authorities," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 95.]

On the Motion that the House do now adjourn,

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said he desired to call attention to a matter which he believed was within the jurisdiction of Mr. Speaker. Considerable interest was now being taken in the proceedings of Parliament, but strangers were unable to obtain admission for the Evening Sitting until half-past eight in the evening, and had to remain outside the Strangers' Entrance until that hour. He understood that on Wednesday evening about 400 persons were standing outside in the wind and rain, and that they began to form in line as early as a quarter before seven o'clock. His purpose in rising was to ask whether, subject to the proper preservation of order within the precincts of the Palace, steps could not be taken to prevent discomfort of that kind arising, as he was confident that officials and Members alike wished to treat strangers as courteously as possible.

***MR. SPEAKER**: I will inquire into the matter. These matters are arranged by the police, after consultation with the Serjeant-at-Arms, but of course the Serjeant-at-Arms will attend to any instructions I may give him.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for re-arranging the boundaries of the dioceses of Bristol and Gloucester, and Bath and Wells." [Bishopric of Bristol Bill [Lords.]

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 13th March, 1905.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND.

Writs and Returns electing the Earl of Darnley a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Viscount Hawarden, deceased, with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto. Delivered (on oath), and Certificate read.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]. Petition for additional provision; of the Great Central Railway Company; together with the proposed clauses and amendments annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners.

Darien Gold Mining Company Bill [H.L.]. Referred to the Examiners.

GAMBLE'S DIVORCE BILL [H.L.].

Petition of Charles George Gamble, of Mount Jerome House, in the county of Dublin, solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, that substituted service of a copy of the Bill and of the Order for the Second Reading thereof, and of all other Orders connected therewith be made upon John Haynes, of 11, Vernon Street, Hammersmith, solicitor, and that in the event of the said Bill not being opposed, he may be permitted to read, as he may be advised, the evidence given on the hearing of this petition as evidence on the Second Reading of the said Bill; considered (according to order). Counsel called in; a witness examined. Bill to be read 2^a on the first sitting day for Judicial business after the Recess at Easter. The usual Orders made. Ordered, That service of a copy of the Bill, and of the Order for the Second Reading thereof, upon the said John Haynes, be deemed as good service of the said Bill and Order as if the same had been personally served upon Ida Gertrude Gamble, the wife of the said Charles George Gamble. Ordered, That, in the event of the said Bill not being opposed, the said John Haynes be permitted to read the said evidence as evidence on the Second Reading of the said Bill.

Hastings Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydfil Scheme Confirmation) Bill [H.L.]; Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill [H.L.]; Hessle Gas Bill [H.L.]; Workington Harbour and Dock Bill [H.L.]; Commercial Union Assurance Bill [H.L.]; Clacton Improvement Bill [H.L.]; Clacton-on-Sea Commissioners Bill [H.L.]; Littlehampton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.):—

E. Hardwicke,
V. Falkland (chairman),
L. Sinclair,
L. Lilford,
L. Carew;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday the 28th instant, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Drogheda be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Hylton.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (REDISTRIBUTION OF THE FLEET).

Arrangements consequent on the redistribution of the Fleet.

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3328. Austria-Hungary (Trieste).

TREATY SERIES, No. 8 (1905).

Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway respecting telegraphic communication between the two countries signed at Stockholm, 2nd February, 1905.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

ARMY (ESTIMATES).

Memorandum of the Secretary of State relating to the Army Estimates of 1905–1906.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS) STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1905.

No. 141. Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, 1905; dated 28th February, 1905.

METROPOLIS WATER ACT, 1902.

First Annual Report of the Metropolitan Water Board, for the year ended 31st March, 1904.

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Report of the proceedings of the Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks, for the year ended 20th November, 1904; with Appendices. Thirteenth Annual Report.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.

Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1904, amending Statute III. ("The Fellows") of the Statutes of the College. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 26.)

NEWCASTLE CHAPTER (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Tuesday the 21st instant.

IMPORT DUTIES IN INDIA.

*The Earl of PORTSMOUTH, who had given notice "To call attention to the statement of the Secretary of State for India at Shere, as reported in *The Times* of 14th December last, that 'They got infinitely more consideration from foreign countries for Indian products than we did for British products. The reason for that was that our hands were tied here, and that they were untied in India'; and to ask His Majesty's Government—(1) In what sense the hands of the British Government are less tied in India than at home; (2) whether as a matter of fact there is any country that admits any Indian products on a lower tariff than the corresponding British products, and if so, what country and what products; and (3) whether India enjoys in the French market the full privilege of most-favoured-nation treatment which the United Kingdom enjoys, and if not, why not," said: My Lords, in calling your Lordships' attention to the speech of the Secretary of State for India I would point out that I have put down on the Paper only a part of what the right hon. Gentleman said relative to this subject; it would, perhaps, be fairer to him that I should read to your Lordships the context. The Secretary of State for India, speaking at Guildford, made use of this language. He said—

> "They had got a revenue tax on all imports in India; they had got the power in India to put on any tax they pleased on any imports, and what was the result? They got infinitely more consideration from foreign countries for Indian products than we got for British products. The reason for that was that our hands were tied here and they were untied in India."

The Secretary of State asked that this country should be allowed to arm itself and untie its hands. That speech, I would remind your Lordships, came at rather a curious psychological political moment. Another sort of political kite had been started of putting a regular tax on all imports in conjunction with Mr. Chamberlain's proposal. Upon the top of that the Secretary of State for India went down to address his constituents at Shere, and if his speech meant anything at all or had any political significance at all—and, of course, a speech by the Secretary of State for India one would suppose to have political significance when relating to India—it is clear that the Indian case was alluded to as a case which we ought to follow, and the taxation of imports in India was held up as being not a necessary evil in order to obtain money, but a great advantage to India and a policy which in itself was most desirable for India and one which we ought to follow. The right hon Gentleman went on to say—

> "Were we so hide-bound by tradition that we were to say what is good for India is not good for this country?"

It seems to me only fair that some reference should be made to what has occurred in the past in regard to the question of taxes upon imports, because I think I shall be able to show your Lordships that it has been the policy not of the Liberal Party only, but of the Conservative Party, to look upon the taxation of imports as not desirable in itself, but only from time to time to be resorted to in order to meet the exigencies of Indian finance. I shall not occupy your Lordships' time long on this point, although it is one which might be discussed at considerable length; but having gone into the matter very carefully I think I can bring before your Lordships a few facts which will place the situation clearly before you and explain exactly what has happened in the past.

From 1860 to 1875 there existed in India a 10 per cent. *ad valorem* duty on all imports. In 1875 the Government of Lord Northbrook reduced the duty to a general average duty of 5 per cent.; but at that time there arose a very considerable agitation in Lancashire against this 5 per cent. duty upon imports which the Secretary of State for India would lead the country to suppose has been for some time generally accepted as a great advantage to India and to this country. I should like to call your Lordships' attention to a despatch written by the late Lord Salisbury to the Governor-General of India on May 31st, 1876. Those were the days, of course, when the Conservative Party were not a protectionist Party. I venture to quote that despatch, because I think the authority of Lord Salisbury on this matter will be generally accepted. As I have said, a considerable agitation arose in Lancashire because it was said that this 5 per cent. duty upon English cotton imports had the effect of giving the Indian manufacturers an artificial advantage over Lancashire manufacturers. Lord Salisbury, in the despatch to which I have referred, used this language—

> "The influences to which I have been referring are the natural advantages which Indian industry possesses—"

The advantages of having manufactures on the spot, cheaper labour, and a home market—

> "and with which no other advantages can permanently compete. It is true that in their presence the effect of the 5 per cent. duty is probably insignificant, but this is usually true in the case of all protective duties. They may be an important constituent in the prosperity of an industry whose existence is artificial, but an industry like the cotton manufacture of India, which has a real and independent vitality, receives little or no benefit from a protective duty. In such cases the consumer is a sufferer in respect of the price and still more in respect of the quality of the article he consumes without any real advantage to the industry which is protected at his expense."

I do not think you can have the case on behalf of free trade put more clearly or better than that. The House of Commons itself—at that time it was a Conservative House of Commons, being under the Government of Lord Beaconsfield—passed on July 11th, 1877, the following Resolution without a division—

> "That the duties now levied upon cotton manufactures imported into India, being protective in their nature and contrary to sound commercial policy, ought to be repealed without delay so soon as the financial condition of India will permit."

In 1879 Lord Lytton was Viceroy of India, and I do not suppose that anybody can say that that distinguished man had any what are called "little-England" tendencies. He enjoyed to an extraordinary degree the personal confidence and shared the political opinions of Lord Beaconsfield. And what was the Indian policy of Lord Lytton at that time? On March 13th, 1879, Lord Lytton abolished the import duty on cotton goods except on the finest qualities and on April 4th, 1879, the House of Commons again dealt with the question and passed the following Resolution, also without a division—

> "That the Indian import duty on cotton goods ought to be abolished as unjust to the Indian consumer, and we accept the recent reduction in the duties as a step towards their total abolition, to which Her Majesty's Government are pledged."

A step further was taken in March, 1882, when, on the advice of Lord Cromer, my noble friend Lord Ripon's Government abolished all import duties except an import duty on salt and liquor, which they were obliged to retain because there existed on both those articles a heavy internal Excise duty. The present system of import duties was resorted to in 1894 only as a means to obtain revenue, and, as the easiest form of taxation, owing to financial embarrassments due to the serious fall in the gold value of the rupee.

I have referred to the history of the case in order to show that in the minds of great Indian statesmen of all Parties this import duty on cotton, which Mr. Brodrick held up as a precedent which we ought to follow, is one which has not been universally or generally acceptable, but has only been resorted to because of the necessity of raising revenue for India. I should like, in connection with this matter, to quote some very remarkable figures. The effect of the abolition of this duty upon merchandise—that is to say, the effect of the policy of my noble friend Lord Ripon—was this, that from 1878, when they first began to reduce the tax upon imports, to 1881 and 1882, when the duties were swept away, the value of the imports into India amounted to £47,000,000, whereas their value from 1881–82 to 1884–85, when the duties had been abolished, increased to £51,000,000.

I have endeavoured to show that the imposition of these duties was a matter of necessity and not of choice. But it should be borne in mind that the Secretary of State for India was speaking inaccurately when he stated that at the present moment there is a general duty of 5 per cent placed on all articles. That is not the case. There are the most striking exemptions, and it is just these exemptions that destroy the use of the Indian case as affecting the fiscal policy of this country. What are the things exempted at the present moment from any import duty in India? Why, grain, coal, railway material, and raw wool. That being so, it is really somewhat surprising that for what I can only suppose to be Party political purposes the Secretary of State for India should make use of the Indian case as one to influence and govern our fiscal policy in this country. In the cases to which I have referred, what passed through the mind of Lord Salisbury when he was Secretary of State for India, and no doubt in the same way through the mind of Lord Lytton and of my noble friend below me, the Marquess of Ripon, was that in all these matters you have to consider very seriously and gravely the interests of the consumer. The population in India, as we know, is poor as compared with the population of this country. The average income per head per year in India amounts to only £2, while it has been computed that in this country the average income amounts to between £30 and £40.

There is another consideration. The Secretary of State for India referred to the Indian precedent as one which enabled the Indian Government to retaliate against a foreign country. I have endeavoured to show, and I think I have succeeded in showing, that the history of this question as regards India is entirely different from what one would judge from the speech of the Secretary of State for India. The great statesmen who in the past have been connected with India have only reverted to these import duties as a means of revenue and not as a feature in general financial policy, and I think that the opinion of present-day statesmen responsible for India is equally at variance with the views of the Secretary of State for India. Your Lordships have no doubt read with great interest the Paper on preferential tariffs which represents the views of the Indian Government. In that Paper they deal very exhaustively and very carefully with the question of retaliation. In Paragraph 10 you will find this statement of policy—

> "If Indian industries are in need of, or should now desire, a measure of protection, protective measures would necessarily seriously affect imports from the United Kingdom, and would only in a secondary degree affect those from foreign countries. We cannot imagine that the merchants of Lancashire or Dundee, to mention two interests alone, would be likely to acquiesce in such a course even though it were accompanied by still higher duties against the foreigner, or that it would be accepted by the Home Government."

These words clearly show that, in regard to India, our hands and their hands are tied by general considerations. While Indian statesmen have always had before them the great problem of the poverty of the people and also the great interest of the consumer, they have always been conscious of the fact that our fiscal policy in regard to India cannot be governed entirely without consideration of the views at the time of the House of Commons; and, as I have mentioned, the House of Commons have repeatedly interfered in the matter and insisted that their point of view should be considered. The letter from the Government of India which I have quoted goes into the particular question that not only from a political, but from an economic, point of view, retaliation is in itself a very dangerous expedient. It says—

> "We are fully alive to the value of the safeguard that we possess in the fact that so much of our exports consists of the materials used in foreign industries, and we believe that, in normal conditions, foreign nations will be deterred by the powerful motive of self-interest from striking at us lest in doing so they might injure themselves. But it would seem to us to be unwise to rely too much upon the hypothesis that India enjoys an effective monopoly in any large number of articles which are essential to the existence of foreign industries. Such a monopoly we at present hold with regard to jute—"

I am informed, however, that jute can now be grown with advantage in China—

> "and perhaps the coarser classes of jute manufactures, as also in til seed, lac, teak wood, myrabolams, and mowra, while in some other articles we enjoy advantages of the nature of a modified monopoly owing to their limited production in but very few countries. With regard, however, to the greater portion of our exports, they compete successfully in foreign markets by reason of their cheapness rather than of their quality or kind. We cannot feel confident that the conditions and requirements of foreign industries have yet been ascertained with the precision and fulness necessary to make them a sufficiently broad and stable basis on which to rest a fiscal policy of very problematic value to India, whilst the consequences of failure might result in irreparable disaster."

I do not, of course, attempt to say what was in the mind of the Secretary of State for India, but it has occurred to me that when he made the speech to which I have referred he may have had in his mind an Act passed in 1899 to amend the Indian Tariff Act. It is quite true that that Act did confer upon the Indian Government certain retaliatory powers, but, as I read the Act—and I should very much like to hear what the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary of State for India has to say in regard to the matter—it only applies to bounty-fed articles, and does not give the Indian Government a general power of retaliation absolutely new or novel in principle. It is only part and parcel of, and gives effect to, the policy of the Sugar Convention of the time, under which it will be remembered India obtained from the French Government the same treatment for its Indian products of coffee and sugar which the French Government gave to the same Brazilian products. But I should like in this connection to remind your Lordships that we on our part did not follow the principle of retaliation, but gave not only to France but to other foreign countries the same advantages which France enjoyed by means of that exchange.

The last Question standing in my name on the Paper refers to the French market. In it I ask the noble Marquess whether India enjoys in the French market the full privilege of most-favoured-nation treatment which the United Kingdom enjoys, and if not, why not? I hope that I may have been wrongly informed in the matter, but the only information I can find dealing with this point, which is a very important one after the statement of the Secretary of State for India, is that contained in the Board of Trade Return of 1904. I find in that Return, on pages 319 and 320, that the products of the United Kingdom do enjoy the most-favoured-nation treatment in France; that France grants the minimum tariff to certain articles, the principal of which are coffee and tea, to British India, but does not grant to India a generally most-favoured-nation tariff upon all of them, and that, with the exceptions indicated, articles imported from British Colonies and India are subject to the French general tariff, which is, of course, very different from most-favoured-nation treatment. I hope the noble Marquess will be able to inform us that since that statement was published in the Board of Trade Return of 1904 we have been able to make arrangements with the French Government to obtain better treatment for Indian and Colonial products. I beg to put to the Government the Questions standing in my name.

*LORD COLERIDGE: My Lords, before the noble Marquess replies I have a Question to ask arising out of the statement made by the noble Earl. I understand that the Secretary of State for India rejoiced in the fact that India was placed in a position differing from this country in that she had within her grasp means whereby she could employ the weapon of retaliation against countries which did not fiscally commend themselves to the Government of India. In 1902, as the noble Marquess well knows, there was a Sugar Convention, and Russia declined to join that Convention. Russia protested that she did not place any bounties upon the exportation of her sugar, and considerable correspondence took place between the noble Marquess who leads this House and the Russian Government as to whether their statement was correct, and I think the noble Marquess proved to demonstration that the Russian Government did indirectly impose what, according to the Convention, would be deemed to be a bounty upon the exportation of their sugar. In the Commercial Treaty with Russia of 1859, which is still in existence, we have a most-favoured-nation clause, and the result is this, that while by the treaty products of the United Kingdom and the Possessions, namely, India, are entitled to the same treatment in Russia as the most favoured nation, on the other hand, we, Great Britain, contract that no higher duty should be levied on any article coming from Russia into the United Kingdom and Possessions than is payable on the importation from any other country. Russia has urged that it is a breach of the most-favoured-nation clause of their treaty to levy a countervailing duty upon Russian sugar. She has retaliated by placing a prohibitive duty upon the importation into Russia of Indian tea.

Tea is one of the staple industries of India, and on the borders of India the trade with a nation of some 140,000,000, all of them large tea drinkers, and a very large prospective market which was growing at the time and might have developed into very large proportions, has been closed to Indian tea. It was thought at one time that this was an insignificant market, but it has been shown that a great deal of Indian tea gets into Russia through the port of Hamburg, and therefore the Board of Trade Returns showing a very small amount of Indian tea going into Russia direct are misleading. India, we are told, has this wonderful weapon of retaliation in her hands. She has seen a large prospective market closed to her by Russia. Now, my Lords, if freedom to retaliate is enjoyed by India, and if this is so admirable a weapon wherewith to reduce to terms a nation that has fiscal opposition to trade with the home country, I ask whether the Government proposes to put that weapon of retaliation into force. India has the revolver which the noble Marquess who leads this House desired. She has a country at which she desires to strike. It was threatened a short time ago that this country was going to use the revolver and retaliate by placing a practically prohibitive duty upon the importation into India of petroleum from Russia. If the noble Marquess and his Government have the courage of their convictions, if this is a weapon not merely to be brandished but to be used, I ask are they going to retaliate upon Russia? Are they, in answer to Russia's retaliation on India, going to prohibit the importation of petroleum into India? If not, my Lords, I do not think that the love they proclaim for the weapon of retaliation is borne out by their action. And if they are going to put a prohibitive duty on petroleum, I should like to ask the noble Marquess what he thinks will be the effect? Does he suppose for a moment that Russia, in answer to the explosion of that weapon, is going to alter her fiscal policy in regard to the importation into her country of Indian tea? If that is not to be the result, the net result of these two retaliatory measures will be that on the one hand Indian tea will be excluded from Russia, and, therefore, Indian tea growers will suffer, and, on the other hand, petroleum will be excluded from India, which will mean higher prices for what is a very necessary article to every poor inhabitant in India. I should like the noble Marquess to indicate to us whether he proposes to use this weapon which is now in his hand, and what he thinks will be the result.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (The Marquess of BATH): My Lords, it is not generally supposed to be a very congenial task to be called upon to explain the speech of another individual, to define his opinions, to interpret his motives, or to guarantee the accuracy of what he said; but I have no hesitation on this occasion in saying that the Secretary of State for

India has no reason at all to doubt the general accuracy of the report of his speech to which the noble Earl has called attention. As your Lordships will readily recognise, it is clearly a very compressed report, a condensed description by the reporter who furnished it to *The Times*, of what my right hon. friend said; but I am perfectly ready to admit in essentials it is an accurate representation of speech. The noble Earl quoted at the commencement of his speech the sentence preceding the words he has put down on the Paper. In his notice the noble Earl calls attention to the statement of the Secretary of State for India that—

> "They got infinitely more consideration from foreign countries for Indian products than we did for British products. The reason for that was that our hands were tied here, and that they were untied in India."

It is right, however, that the whole context should be placed before your Lordships in considering this matter, and accordingly I will read the passages which led up to the extract quoted. My right hon. friend said—

> "For his own part he wanted the largest amount of free trade which could be got. When he said that he was told that he was a platitudinarian. He sat down with great satisfaction under that designation, because he thought the time had come for us to look back fifty years and see whether any one of the conceptions which were formed by those who then advocated the measures by which free trade was secured had been realised. He was an adherent of Mr. Balfour in this matter, and those of that way of thinking had endeavoured to see whether they could not bring down these tariffs which were placing 60 per cent., in some instances, on the products of this country when sent abroad. What was asked was that the country should be allowed to arm itself and untie its hands. He represented India, which was a free-trade country. They had got a revenue tax on all imports in India; they had got the power in India to put on any tax they pleased on any imports. What was the result?"

Then follows the sentence which appears in the notice placed on your Lordships' Paper by the noble Earl. Before I deal with the Questions put to me, I think it necessary that I should draw your Lordships' attention to the fact that in the second Question the noble Earl has interpolated a very important word which does not exist in the report of my right hon. friend's speech. He asks whether, as a matter of fact, there is any country that admits any Indian products on a lower tariff than the "corresponding" British products, and if so, what country and what products. The Secretary of State never used the word "corresponding."

The Earl of PORTSMOUTH: I did not say he did. I have asked for specific Answers to these Questions.

*The Marquess of BATH: The inference any one would draw is that the noble Earl framed his Questions on the speech of my right hon. friend.

The Earl of PORTSMOUTH: No.

*The Marquess of BATH: I regret that I should have misunderstood the noble Earl's Questions, but whether or not the Questions are framed on my right hon. friend's speech I repeat that the word "corresponding" cannot be inferred from anything the Secretary of State said. The noble Earl has traversed a good deal of ground. He has dealt with subjects more or less remotely connected with the Questions on the Paper, but very slightly relevant to the speech of the Secretary of State. In the first instance, the noble Earl asks in what sense the hands of the British Government are less tied in India than at home. My answer to that is that the Government in India have greater freedom in the matter of tariff than is permitted to the Executive Government at home in three important particulars. The first is the statute law, the second is the character of Indian import tariffs, and the third is the nature of the import and export trade of India. With regard to the statute law, Section 23 of the Indian Sea Customs Act lays down that the Governor-General in Council can, without resort to the Legislature, exempt, by notification in the *Gazette*, goods imported to or exported from India from the whole or part of the Customs duties. This power has been exercised in two notable instances, the first of which the noble Earl has already alluded to. In 1878–1879 Lord Lytton, who was then Governor-General, repealed the duties on cotton manufactured goods and on a large number of other articles; and, more recently still, Lord Curzon has reduced from 5 per cent. to 2½ per cent. the duty on vinegar and copperas in order to give effect to the convention which was recently concluded with France by which India acquired the benefit of the French minimum tariff on colonial produce. By the Indian Tariff Act the Governor-General in Council, by notification in the *Gazette*, is empowered to place countervailing duties on bounty-fed articles the produce of any country, dependency, or colony on import into India. Neither the power to abolish or reduce existing duties, nor the power to impose countervailing duties, belongs to the Executive Government at home without reference to Parliament.

I should, I think, acknowledge quite frankly that the Indian Government, notwithstanding the statutory powers which it possesses, is under the control of the Secretary of State, who is himself responsible to Parliament for what he sanctions and what he does. I would further observe that the practice has generally been—and where it has been thought advisable—for the Government of India to ascertain the views of the Secretary of State in any contemplated exercise of its powers. But Parliament in its wisdom has always recognised that India should have a wide and generous exemption from interference in the management of its own taxation in its own interests. Further, Parliament, with great discretion, has refrained from interference with the imposition of taxation by the Indian Government, an interference which it very wisely and properly exercises with regard to the imposition of taxation by the Government at home.

Turning to the character of India's import tariff, I would observe that a revenue duty on a large number of imported articles is a weapon ready to the hand of the Indian Government that does not exist in the case of the Home Government, which confines its duties to a very few specified articles. The import tariff in India affects a large number of small articles, not, it is true, bringing in a large amount, and I submit that it would be possible without inconvenience to the finances of India to make concessions in regard to a large number of these articles in any question of negotiations with foreign Powers.

The Marquess of Bath.

India also obtains to a certain extent greater freedom than this country from the nature of her import and export trade. The exports of India, as compared with her imports, for the five years ended 1903, stand in the relation of three to two, whereas the exports of the United Kingdom, as compared with our imports, bear the relation of three to five. It must be borne in mind, in discussing this question, that while Indian exports are composed to the extent of very nearly one-half of raw material, and, if you add food stuffs, to the extent of quite three-fourths, the exports from the United Kingdom consist to the extent of four-fifths of manufactured goods. I venture to submit that there is not much that is "corresponding" in these figures.

It should also be remembered that the protective tariffs of foreign countries affect India, engaged as she is in the production of raw material, far less than they do those countries which are engaged in the export of manufactured goods. Moreover, India does enjoy a modified monopoly in regard to certain articles which she produces; and I submit that this affords her a weapon ready to hand as a means of retaliation, if she is attacked, by raising the prices of these exports which are themselves of supreme or vital necessity to the countries which import them. The noble and learned Lord who spoke just before me, asked a Question with regard to retaliatory tariffs. He instanced the case of the Russian surtax on tea, and I understood him to ask why the Indian Government had not put their powers into force in dealing with this increase of duty. It is perfectly true that the Russian Government have raised to a very large extent their duties on Indian and Ceylon tea imported into Russia; but it was found on examining the case that while these duties were operative on tea entering Russia by Odessa, that was not the case with regard to tea entering Russia by Dalny and by Vladivostock. While the Indian Government would have been perfectly prepared, as the noble and learned Lord suggested, to take the case of petroleum in hand——

*LORD COLERIDGE: I did not suggest it.

*THE MARQUESS OF BATH: They recognised that the import of tea into Russia was, as a matter of fact, not affected; and I believe I am right in stating that the Returns for the last nine months show an actual increase of the tea trade in that direction. With regard to the second Question which the noble Earl asked, I have ventured to submit to the House that the use of the word "corresponding" is misleading. The contention of my right hon. friend, which, I submit, is borne out by the facts I have ventured to state to your Lordships, was that India does obtain for her staple products of raw material greater consideration from European countries than the United Kingdom obtains for its staple products of manufactured goods. The staple products are not identical and cannot be corresponding. The fact remains, however, that Indian exports are more lightly taxed than the exports of the United Kingdom. I will read to your Lordships two brief extracts from the despatch of the Government of India to which the noble Earl has already alluded. They state, after going through the facts, that—

> "The net result is that Indian exports, to a value exceeding £38,000,000 sterling and approximating to one-half of the entire volume of our export trade, are admitted free of duty into the consuming markets, while of the remainder a considerable proportion is either subject to relatively moderate duties, or, as in the United Kingdom, to duties imposed for purely revenue purposes and with no attempt to differentiate against us."

And at the end of their Report they say—

> "All that we seek is that we shall not be pledged in advance to accord equal treatment to the imports of all countries alike, irrespective of whether they penalise our exports or not. And we are hopeful that the mere announcement that our hands are free will of itself suffice to maintain us in the enjoyment of that considerable measure of free exchange which we already possess, and from time to time even to extend it."

Now, my Lords, I come to the third Question put by the noble Earl, and it is one which requires a slight explanation. I have to inform the noble Earl that France does not extend to the colonial dominions of those countries which enjoy the full privileges of the most-favoured-nation treatment the same privileges that she extends to them, and the reason why she does not give the most-favoured-nation treatment to all goods of Indian origin is that she declines to extend to countries in the East, where labour is cheaper, those advantages. But I submit that, as a matter of fact, India occupies a far more favourable position with France in regard to her products than the United Kingdom. The French Government, in framing a minimum tariff applicable to European States, have framed it with a consideration of the conditions which regulate production in Western countries. Their rates represent what they believe to be the adequate protection of French industry against competition in Western countries, and consequently, as a matter of traditional policy, the French Government declines to extend to the colonial dominions of the countries with which she trades the most-favoured-nation treatment which she gives to the mother country. That is the established policy of France, but it has been very considerably modified by India in the case of the convention to which allusion has already been made this evening.

Although it is not a matter that arises on the question, I wish to make it plain that I have not ventured, in what I have said, to suggest any desire on the part of India to engage in a war of duties. What I do contend is that, while the nature of India's trade, and the character of her tariff, make her less vulnerable than the United Kingdom, she owes a large portion of her immunity from impediments to trade to the fact that she is free, if she wishes it, to retaliate. I have to thank your Lordships for the patient indulgence with which you have listened to me on a subject of which, while I know it excites great interest, the details cannot be said to be interesting. I will not venture to hazard any statement as to whether the Answers I have given may or may not be satisfactory to the noble Earl, but I trust, at all events, that I have made it clear to the House that the Secretary of State for India was both accurate in what he said and justified in the conclusions he drew.

*LORD REAY: My Lords, I do not agree with the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary of State for India that the subject to which my noble friend behind me has called attention is one the details of which are not interesting.

*THE MARQUESS OF BATH: I should have said the figures.

*LORD REAY: Nothing seems to me to be of more vital interest to the prosperity of India than the question of the use which is made of those powers which the noble Marquess has accurately stated the Executive Government of India possess, and which the Government at home have not. The fact that the Executive in India have the power of exempting articles from duty, of reducing the duty, and of imposing countervailing duties, makes it doubly necessary for us to keep a watchful eye on the proceedings of that Government, and also fully justifies my noble friend in calling attention to words which reveal something of what in literary circles is called the mental attitude towards these problems of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India. The noble Marquess alluded to the Act XIV. of 1899, which gives the Governor-General of India in Council the right to impose a countervailing duty to the extent to which a bounty in a foreign country favours exportation therefrom. The Act was applied to sugar and the result shows clearly the danger and the risk of entering on a countervailing policy. In 1902 the Financial Member of the Government of India came down to the Indian Legislative Council and had to admit that the policy of the countervailing duty introduced by the Act of 1899, as regards sugar, had completely failed, and he was obliged to propose an additional duty in order to meet the bounties which resulted from the cartels or trusts organised by the sugar growers and manufacturers of Germany and Austria. No doubt a measure of that kind was more easy to pass through the Legislature of India than it would have been if it had been proposed in Parliament here, and, as is usually the case with measures submitted to the Indian Legislature, those additional countervailing duties were adopted without great difficulty. This seems to me to be an object-lesson in the policy of countervailing duties—you know where you begin, but you cannot foresee where you are to stop.

What I think we have a right to ask s whether, in view of the encomium passed by the Secretary of State for India on the policy represented by the Act of 1899, he is of opinion that it would be desirable to pass a similar Act here giving the Home Government the same power, the same rights, the same weapon which the Government of India has at its disposal under that Act of 1899. I think it is quite fair to draw that conclusion from the language quoted by my noble friend. Allusion has been made to the convention of February, 1902, with France, and in the despatch of the Government of India, to which reference has been made, they seem to consider that a great advantage was obtained in that convention by the very small concession of 2½ per cent. on vinegar and copperas which became applicable to all countries. As explained by the noble Marquess, the reason that that concession was so easily obtained was that France was then engaged in a tariff war with Brazil, and in order to justify the preference given to certain Indian exports it was important to obtain a small concession from India. The noble Marquess seemed to indicate that the policy of negotiation with foreign Powers could be carried out on a large scale by means of the Indian tariff, and that it gives opportunities for such a policy which our tariff does not give. But at the same time the noble Marquess stated that the Secretary of State for India had declared that India was a free-trade country, and that the tariff was only one for revenue. I wish to call his attention to the fact that you cannot use a tariff for revenue for purposes of negotiation, except to any limited degree; if you were to do it on a large scale, then obviously you would interfere with the finances of India to an extent which would be unwarrantable. If you are bent on carrying out that policy of negotiation, then you must introduce in India, as is the case in other countries which have a protectionist fiscal policy, a maximum tariff. The margin between the maximum and the minimum tariff would give you the power of negotiating which a revenue tariff does not give. Therefore, my contention is that the instance given of these negotiations with France is not one which can be quoted as a precedent for similar negotiations with other Powers, and that the statement of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India that his hands were untied is not accurate because they are tied by the necessities of Indian finance.

Allusion has been made, and I need not further dwell on it, to the question of the increased duty on tea imposed by Russia. The noble Marquess was quite accurate when he stated that the object of the Russian duty was to divert the tea trade to Dalny and to the Siberian Railway. The Government of India were prepared to retaliate by imposing a differential duty on Russian petroleum. This duty would have inflicted on the millions who light their huts with oil, a burden which their very limited purchasing power would have made a serious hardship. Fortunately the duty was not imposed. The noble Marquess alluded to another alternative—namely, retaliation by export duties. I cannot conceive a more unfortunate policy than a policy which would enhance the cost of Indian exports, and I should wish to receive some assurance that there is no intention on the part of the Secretary of State to enter upon such a policy. The Government of India state in the despatch which has been several times quoted this evening that "in no circumstances whatever would they allow a policy of retaliation to develop into one of aggression." They "recognise that it would be a calamity should they become involved in such struggles with the important purchasers of their exported produce." Now, I should like to ask this question, Where do you draw the line between a policy of retaliation and a policy of tariff wars? If you start on a policy of retaliation you will almost inevitably be drawn into a policy of tariff wars.

We cannot forget that the foreign trade of India is the great security for the redemption of the debt of India to this country. The balance of trade with the United Kingdom is adverse to India, but the balance of trade between India and foreign countries is largely in favour of India. Less than 30 per cent. of her exports come to the United Kingdom, and, as the noble Marquess has admitted, a large portion of the exports of India are admitted free of duty because they are composed mainly of raw materials and food-stuffs. The Government of India point out that—

> "If by a change of fiscal policy the balance of trade in favour of India should dwindle or disappear, the whole work of ten years will be sacrificed; and the set-back to our trade, our revenue, and our credit would immensely outweigh any benefits that we might reasonably expect from the most unconditional surrender of our opponents in the war of tariffs."

I ask whether the Secretary of State endorses this opinion of the Government of India, and whether, if India is to be represented at the conference in 1906—and I suppose India will be represented at that conference—her representative will be allowed to make a statement such as that made by the Government of India in their despatch. The representative of India will at that conference represent 300,000,000 of His Majesty's subjects, as against 50,000,000 of Britons throughout the Empire. I wish to be assured that no measures will be taken, no use will be made of the liberty to which the Secretary of State has alluded, to impose artificial restrictions of any kind on the trade of India, and to destroy the freedom of trade which she has enjoyed in recent years.

India's manufactures, industries, and mineral resources certainly require development, but no protection is needed for the purpose, because there is a redundant population, and, therefore, cheap labour available to any extent. What you want is capital and skill. A recent important document published by the Government of India—I refer to the review of Mr. T. H. Holland, Director of the Geological Survey of India—shows what her mineral resources are. What can be done by the enterprise of individuals has been shown by one of the leading representatives of the Parsee community of Bombay, the late Mr. Tata, who at his own expense brought American mining experts to the Central Provinces, with the result that in the district of Raipur immense quantities of extremely rich iron ore have now been discovered. What I look forward to is not the imposition of duties on Indian exports, not the removal of Customs duties in order to please foreign countries; but the removal of such duties as those on cotton goods, which will allow the Indian purchaser of those goods to purchase them at a lower rate than at present. Our first consideration with regard to the Indian tariff is how it effects the welfare of our Indian fellow-subjects. I think the Secretary of State for India will admit that if his hands are untied in some respects as regards legislation, they are certainly not untied as regards the economic condition of India; and I trust that he will not use the liberty which he possesses by altering the policy to which I think the prosperous condition of Indian finances is largely due.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: My Lords, I venture to offer a few remarks to your Lordships on this subject, because I wish to carry the argument a step further and lay before the House a consideration which it seems to me is worthy of its attention. The noble Marquess who replied on behalf of the Government has shown that the statements of the Secretary of State for India in the speech which has been quoted were accurate in fact and substance, and that there are on record certain instances in which the Government of India have been enabled to put into practice the principles embodied in the remarks of the Secretary of State. The noble Lord who has just sat down took exception to one instance, that of the countervailing duties upon sugar imposed by the Government of India, and he deprecated such legislation because of the fear he entertained as to where such steps might eventually land the nation which took them. But, my Lords, I find in the Blue-book from which he and other speakers have quoted these words—

> "It is possible, also, that the course taken by India in 1899, in imposing countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar, may have had some share in inducing the bounty-giving countries of Europe to participate in the Brussels Conference, whose object was the abolition of bounties on sugar, thus securing a freer exchange of this commodity."

Those of your Lordships who believe that that Convention has done a great deal towards securing free exchange of sugar, will highly commend the step taken by the Government of India which led to that beneficent result. I find, further, that, however untied the hands of the Secretary of State for India may be at this moment, the Council of India ask in this Blue-book for further freedom. They say, on page 10—

> "Even where no actively hostile action has supervened, and nothing further than friendly negotiations are in progress, it seems probable that greater freedom of policy on our part would be attended with beneficial results."

It seems to me, therefore, that the words of the Secretary of State are more than justified.

India is in a peculiar position. In the words of Sir Edward Law, the Financial Adviser to the Council, India pursues a fiscal system which is neither free trade, fair trade, nor protection. If I were to venture to characterise that system, I would call it "tied" trade. India is largely a tied house to England. We interfere in her system to a large extent, and her Government is not entirely independent of ours. The point to which I would ask your attention is this, that had a system of entire liberty of action subsisted between this country and the Empire of India, certain fiscal events in the history of this country and India might have had very different results. The hands of the Secretary of State as regards Indian matters are untied as against foreign nations, but they are tied as against this country. Had there been entire liberty of negotiation on the part of India, can it be supposed that the tea duty, which we have increased in England from 4d. to 6d. and from 6d. to 8d., would have been so often raised without active opposition on the part of the Indian Government? And does not the history of the Indian cotton duties show that Lancashire at any rate has something to be thankful for in the fiscal relations existing between this country and India?

The fact is that the relations between this country and India more nearly approximate to the ideal of free trade than those of almost any other two countries. It is not a perfect and ideal free trade, but, as approximating to the ideal, it is the nearest we can arrive at, and in considering a system of retaliation for this country, similar to the system which His Majesty's Government can use in India, I submit that it is of the highest importance that the hands of the mother country and the Colonies should be tied as against each other, and that there should be satisfactory relations subsisting between them similar to those between us and India. In other words, if we are going to deal with foreign countries in a spirit of retaliation, it is necessary that we should be at least secure of our own Colonies. I have said that the system subsisting between this country and India is a satisfactory one, inasmuch as it closely approximates to the free-trade ideal, but I do not imagine that we need be perfectly satisfied with the system as it exists. I am convinced that there is no Member of this House who would not say that no system of Imperial preference, no system for a British Zollverein, would be perfect in which India did not play a prominent part, and at the forthcoming Colonial Conference India should be well represented.

I venture to think that there are a considerable number of points well worthy of the attention of such a Conference from the point of view of India. After all, India exports a great quantity of raw material which is necessary for the countries of the world. India exported to this country 20,000,000 cwts. of wheat the year before last, and last year over 20,000,000 cwts. India exports a great quantity of jute, oils, seeds, and so forth. It is surely well worth the consideration of such a Conference whether a preference on wheat and so forth would not greatly assist India, and whether a system of export duties in India similar to the duty existing on rice might not do a great deal of good towards diverting much of that trade to this country which now goes to Continental countries. The mother country has a right, considering the part she has played in the development of India, to ask for consideration in this and other kindred questions. India is in a higher state of development than any other tropical country, and the demand for tropical goods is constantly increasing. Therefore we hold in our hands a considerable weapon. I have ventured to trouble your Lordships with these few remarks because it seems to me that India is peculiarly a case wherein our relations have been satisfactory, and it is of the greatest importance that His Majesty's Government, if they are going to embark upon a policy of retaliation against other countries, should also establish satisfactory relations with our Colonies, remembering that had those satisfactory relations between ourselves and India not subsisted it might have been impossible for any British Chancellor of the Exchequer to have obtained the necessary revenue from increased duties on tea, and Lancashire might have suffered very much from the increased duties India might have imposed upon cotton.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of Lansdowne): My Lords, however much we may differ with regard to the important subject discussed this evening, we shall, I think, be unanimous in welcoming the appearance of the noble Lord who has just addressed the House, who has shown in his speech that he can contribute to our debates with ability and advantage. The noble Lord who raised this question did so apparently with the object of showing to your Lordships that the Secretary of State for India, in a speech lately delivered by him, was inaccurate with regard to certain statements of fact. The noble Marquess who represents the India Office must, I think, have convinced the House that as far as the accuracy of that speech is concerned it is not open to criticism. The noble Lord, however, drew from that speech a number of inferences, many of them, it seemed to me, far-fetched and of an exaggerated character, and I must protest, in the name of my right hon. colleague, against the kind of construction which the noble Lord placed on his remarks. Another noble Lord detected in the speech of my right hon. friend what he called an encomium framed with the idea of suggesting that the tariff legislation of this country might be assimilated to the tariff legislation of India. I do not find any trace of such a suggestion in my right hon. friend's speech. The noble Lord also dwelt on the limitations to which the use of a moderate revenue tariff must necessarily be liable. That is a self-evident proposition which we can scarcely dispute. He even commented on the terrible iniquity of a duty on petroleum, which I understand has never been imposed. I shall not follow the two noble Lords into these regions. The few words which I propose to address to your Lordships shall be limited to the questions before the House. I do not think there can be any doubt, as stated by the Secretary for India, that the Government of India does enjoy a real, although possibly a small, advantage under the present system of its tariff arrangements. There can be no question that India has an amount of freedom in these matters which is denied to the mother country. I am not going to dispute that that freedom must be exercised subject to the general supervision and control of Parliament. That, of course, goes without saying, but making every allowance for that, India does, in fact, enjoy a liberty which we do not possess. What your Lordships may not remember is that this liberty is one which this country at one time did enjoy and which was taken away from it. In 1845, a Customs Duties Act was passed under which it was enacted—

> "That it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by and with the advice of her Privy Council, by her Order in Council, from time to time to order and direct that there shall be levied and collected any additional duty, not exceeding one-fifth of the amount of any existing duty, upon all or any goods, wares, or merchandise, the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country which shall levy higher or other duties upon any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of any of Her Majesty's dominions than upon the like article, the growth, produce, or manufacture of any other foreign country."

That was a power which this country actually enjoyed between the years 1845 and 1853. In the latter years by a Customs Consolidation Act, that statute was repealed and the power was taken away. It is also the case, as the noble Marquess was able to show the House, that the power thus conferred on the Indian Government has not remained in abeyance, but has been actually exercised with very useful results. There was the case of the alteration of the tariff by Lord Lytton in 1878–9; but there was to my mind a much more remarkable case in the convention with France in 1903, when India was able, by reducing her import duties from 5 per cent. to 2½ per cent. on certain articles in which French trade was interested, to obtain the admission of certain other products in which India was largely interested under the minimum as distinguished from the maximum French tariff. That was a clear case of a transaction highly beneficial to India, and which India would not have been able to accomplish had she not been in a position to offer something in exchange for what she required from a foreign country.

It seems to me to be self-evident that the enjoyment of this statutory power, coupled with the existence of a moderate all-round tariff and with the power of modifying and varying that tariff from time to time, does place in the hands of the Indian Government an extremely useful weapon for the purpose of any negotiations with other Powers into which from time to time it may be necessary for her to enter. It is clear also that the Government of India attaches very great value and importance to the retention of that power. As to the treatment of Indian products in foreign countries, it may be said that, as a general average, Indian products are subject to duties ranging between 1 and 11 per cent., while British products are subject to duties averaging between 13 and 35 per cent., a very considerable advantage accruing to Indian products as distinguished from the products of this country. When we come to the case of France, that advantage is retained. In France Indian products are subject to duties averaging 5 per cent. as against an average of 34 per cent. paid by British products. That is a much more substantial benefit than anything that India could derive under the most-favoured-nation treatment. However desirable the most-favoured-nation treatment may be in theory, it has not always in practice produced the results which you might hope to derive from it. In these days of highly-specified tariffs and very minute classification it is always quite easy for the ingenious people who contrive tariffs to befriend the country they wish to befriend and to damage the country they wish to damage without denying or depriving of most-favoured-nation treatment those who are entitled to it.

The noble Lord who opened the debate had another object in view which I for one can appreciate—I mean the desire to obtain from His Majesty's Government some kind of assurance that they did not harbour any designs which could deprive India of the advantage she now enjoys or jeopardise her commercial prosperity. I cannot help thinking that it was almost superfluous to suggest that His Majesty's Government could be so extremely unwise as to meditate the imposition upon the Indian Empire of any tariff system unsuited to its requirements. I am tempted to remind your Lordships of a debate which took place in this House two years ago upon a kindred question, when four ex-Viceroys of India got up in their places and were unanimous in declaring that we could be no parties to any change in the tariff arrangements of India which might have a prejudicial effect on the prosperity of that great Empire. We all of us admitted that the position of India differed very greatly from that of the self-governing Colonies, and that the Indian question must be considered with reference to Indian interests. That has been, so far as I am aware, the attitude which the Government has always assumed when discussing this subject, and it is also the attitude which has been assumed by the Government of India in the despatch which has been quoted to-night.

With reference to the points raised by Lord Reay, if I were inclined to fence with the noble Lord I should reply that it is a little premature to ask the Government to announce the particular treatment which they intend to prescribe for India, should they ever be called in and asked to prescribe. We have stated very distinctly that, so far as this Government are concerned, we have no intention to propose new measures of this description. But I do not want to put off my noble friend with a dilatory answer; and I say unhesitatingly that nothing is further from our thoughts, or from the intentions we have repeatedly and publicly proclaimed, than an attack upon free trade whether in India or elsewhere. I hear an incredulous murmur from the front bench opposite, and I think that murmur is probably due to the fact that noble Lords opposite are aware that our interpretation of the words "free trade" and "protection" does not always absolutely agree with theirs. But noble Lords opposite are evidently not quite clear in their minds on this point. If I wished to prove that I should refer to the speech of Lord Reay, who constantly spoke of India as a free-trade country, in spite of the fact that India has a general tariff upon imports and has the power of varying that tariff from time to time in order to obtain valuable consideration from some other Power. I always understood that that was the unholy thing we were warned against, and I am glad to find the minds of noble Lords so far open that they see that a country may remain free trade although it has a tariff which it is allowed, with the least possible difficulty and inconvenience, to modify from time to time when it desires to do so.

With regard to the question whether India is to be represented at the Conference in 1906, there again I speak with bated breath, because I feel that we are scarcely in a position to take upon ourselves to say what conditions shall be imposed upon that Conference, or what procedure shall be followed when it assembles; but so far as we have any voice or part in the matter, we say that in our contemplation no such Conference could usefully be assembled unless India was given the fullest and amplest opportunity of making her wishes known and felt before any final decision was come to. In the Prime Minister's memorable speech in Edinburgh your Lordships will find that stated in the most categorical manner. I am very glad, if it will give noble Lords any satisfaction, to reaffirm that statement to-night; and to say that, in my opinion, and, I believe, in that of my colleagues, there is no idea whatever of imposing upon a reluctant India any system unsuited to her requirements or which in the judgment of those best competent to express her opinions would be detrimental to her interests.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, the noble Marquess who has just sat down seemed very pleased because my noble friend behind me spoke of India as a free-trade country. India, no doubt, has now certain duties levied for purposes of revenue, but she gave a most distinct proof of a free-trade policy by placing an Excise to balance the duties which she found it necessary to place upon the imports of cotton. I think a country that has done that is entitled still to call herself a free-trade country.

Before I proceed to deal with what seems to me to be the most vital question we are concerned with to-night, I should like to say a few words with respect to the convention with France. There is a little obscurity about that matter. The convention has never, I believe, been laid before Parliament. It is discussed to-night by Ministers; doubtless they will lay it before Parliament to-morrow; but I hear rumours—I do not know whether they are true or not—that that convention, made in 1903, has never to this day been ratified, but is, nevertheless, actually in force. Now that, surely, is a curious state of things. I should never dream of pitting my judgment upon a question of diplomatic practice against that of my noble friend opposite, who is so great a master of diplomatic science; but I should have thought that to carry an unratified treaty into actual operation was a proceeding of a very curious kind. It certainly is a proceeding which must give very little satisfaction to India, because if the treaty has not been ratified it has no legal effect at all. When the treaty is laid on the Table there will probably be found an Article in it providing that it cannot be brought to a conclusion without due notice, but so long as it is not ratified it can be put an end to at any moment. Therefore I feel some difficulty in comprehending the exact position in which we stand in regard to that question, and I should be glad if some member of His Majesty's Government would tell us whether or not the treaty has been ratified. Am I not right in saying that this country has given to all countries the advantages which she gave to France under that convention? If so, we have done a very right thing, and it is a proof that there is still some lingering attachment to free-trade principles among noble Lords opposite.

I am not about to enter into any argument with the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary with respect to Mr. Brodrick's speech, nor am I going to make any special attack on that speech as a speech. I confess I was a little surprised to hear from the noble Marquess that he admitted, in a general way, the accuracy of the report of that speech. I certainly expected that he would have said that the report was not accurate. He did say it was condensed, and the majority of us know, to our regret, that condensed reports do not always give an accurate idea of what is said. The report in question represents Mr. Brodrick to have made a variety of assertions which are incorrect. The report makes him say that they had got the power in India of putting on any tax they pleased on any imports. "They" means the Government of India. When my noble friend opposite spoke he alluded to the powers which India enjoyed. He meant the powers which the Executive Government of India enjoyed. India would enjoy these powers just as much if the Executive Government had to get their new duties confirmed by the Legislative Council. It is not India that enjoys these powers, it is the Executive Government that enjoys them.

Then we are told by the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary that Mr. Brodrick's statement was correct on three grounds, one of those grounds being the difference between the products of India and of this country. That is a natural advantage, and it cannot possibly have been meant by Mr. Brodrick when he made his speech. That is an advantage which India possesses because she happens to have some products which other people want; but it is not a special, or a legislative, or a political advantage. Then we come to the Act, to which the noble Marquess alluded, by which the Governor-General in Council is empowered to reduce or remit duties. The Governor-General in Council has no power under that Act—indeed, the noble Marquess did not say he had—of putting on duties. He can only take them off or lower them, and there remains nothing except the Act which was passed in 1899 with reference to the Sugar Convention. That Act is very strictly limited. It gives a power, no doubt, to the Executive Government in

India which I should not like to see the Executive Government in this country possess, because I do not think that at the present moment we should be particularly inclined to render the enactment of a new Sugar Convention easy. It has not been so eminently successful as to make that desirable.

But the real question, or what seems to me to be the most important question to-night, is this—Are we to take the speech of Mr. Brodrick, of a Cabinet Minister, as representing the policy and the wishes of His Majesty's Government? We all know that Cabinet discipline is not very strictly enforced by the present Prime Minister, but I am old enough to believe that Lord Melbourne was right when on one occasion when Prime Minister he put his back to the door of the Cabinet room just as the members were leaving, and said—

> "Gentlemen, it does not signify a hang what we say, but we must all say the same thing."

That is not the invariable practice of the present Government, and we have long been puzzled to know what is this famous retaliatory policy of which so much is heard and so little is known. Has it been explained by Mr. Brodrick or not? Do His Majesty's Government desire to have that to which Mr. Brodrick points—namely, a large power conferred upon the Government of the country to impose or alter Customs duties without the special consent of Parliament in each case? That, my Lords, is a very simple question. It can be answered at once. If the Prime Minister was in your Lordships' House and I was asking him the question, I should not expect an answer, "Yes" or "No." But possibly noble Lords on the front bench opposite are not quite so clever as Mr. Balfour, and I hope, therefore, there will be some answer given to this important question.

Are we to understand from this speech, which has been, as I understand it, approved by His Majesty's Government, that the policy of the Prime Minister—the policy of which we hear in general terms so much, and the details of which are so carefully concealed from us—is to confer upon the Executive Government of this country a right to impose, alter, or remit duties without the special consent of Parliament in each case? That, my Lords, appears to me to be the most vital point in this discussion. It is very natural that matters relating to India should have occupied the greater portion of your Lordships' time to-night, and I should be the last person to grudge any discussion upon those matters. But my noble friend opposite is under a complete delusion if he thinks that we were desirous of attributing to His Majesty's Government any intention of doing injury to India with regard to fiscal matters. What I fear is that they will take this Indian example, which in itself is small, but which is easily capable of expansion, for the purpose of what they call untying their hands in this country. Now, to untie the hands of the Executive Government is to tie the hands of Parliament. It is touching very closely some of the most fundamental rights which have been obtained for us by our forefathers, and it is a policy to which I and those with whom I am accustomed to act on these benches will give most determined and uncompromising opposition.

The LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of Salisbury): My Lords, the noble Marquess opposite has put a definite Question to His Majesty's Government, which deserves and ought to receive a reply. I think it was clear from the speeches of the noble Marquess the Under-Secretary and of my noble friend beside me that the speech of the Secretary of State for India was a statement of fact which was true in all particulars. Why more than that should be read into those observations passes my comprehension. The noble Marquess opposite laughs. He seems to think that a speech is to be examined, not in respect of what it contains, but what it possibly might indicate. Let me apply that line of argument to the noble Marquess's speech. He has told us a story about Lord Melbourne on a certain occasion putting his back against the door of the Cabinet room just as the members were leaving, and saying—

> "Gentleman, it does not signify a hang what we say, but we must all say the same thing."

We now know what will be the principle which will guide the policy of the Government of which the noble Marquess will, no doubt, be a member in the next Parliament. It is, that it does not matter at all what Ministers say so long as they all say the same thing. If the electors of this country have it in their will, as they undoubtedly have it in their power, to change the present Government for another, we shall watch with great interest how the noble Marquess and his colleagues live up to this doctrine. We shall notice that they always say the same thing——

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I hope they will.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: They may say the same thing, but from my experience of noble Lords opposite and right hon. and hon. Gentlemen of their Party, I shall be very surprised if they think the same thing; and I am a little surprised at the candour of the noble Marquess in telling us beforehand how much confidence we are to place in the statements of himself and his colleagues when they constitute the Government. The speech of my noble friend the Secretary of State for India is to be examined in the light of precisely what it contains without any speculation as to what my right hon. friend was supposed to have had at the back of his mind. All that we have to say in answer to the Questions put to us is that the speech is true in substance and in fact, and upon that we rest our case. The Question with regard to the French treaty is one which I must leave to my noble friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to answer.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: The noble Marquess has not answered the Question which has been put to him very pointedly by the noble Marquess opposite. I have asked that Question myself several times, and have not got an Answer.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Will you repeat the Question?

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: The Question is this, Whether His Majesty's Government seek for executive powers, which, in some respects, are exercised by the Indian Government, of changing materially the taxation of the country without reference to Parliament?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My noble friend knows as well as I do that it is absolutely impossible to withdraw matters from the cognisance of Parliament. The specific Answer to the specific Question of the noble Marquess is that His Majesty's Government have always declined to give any communication of what policy they may or may not submit to a future Parliament. I am very glad to repeat that Answer, and I hope it will be distinctly understood.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, if I am not out of order, I will answer the specific Question put to me by the noble Marquess opposite. The noble Marquess asked whether the French Convention was put into operation before it had been ratified. The facts are these. The convention was signed by the French Ambassador and myself in February, 1903. So far as His Majesty's Government were concerned, that was enough for us. But according to French law, in a case of that kind an exchange of ratifications is necessary. The convention was not adopted by the French Senate until December 17th, 1904; and it was not until January of this year that we received from the French Government an intimation that they were ready for the necessary exchange of ratifications. But in the meantime, by an informal arrangement, it was determined that the convention should come into operation, and it has, in fact, been in operation since the time it was signed.

The subject then dropped.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill I shall not repeat what has been so often said as to the great importance of this subject. I have received a letter from the bankers of London urging the high importance of this measure to the commercial community, and expressing their earnest hope that the Government will pass it into law. The names of the bankers who signed the letter are Robarts, Lubbock and Co., the Union of London and Smith's Bank (Limited), Barclay and Co. (Limited), the National Provincial Bank of England, the London and Westminster Bank (Limited), Glyn, Mills, Currie and Co., Martin's Bank (Limited), the London and County Bank, Parr's Bank (Limited), the Capital and Counties Bank (Limited), the London Joint Stock Bank, the London City and Midland Bank, Williams, Deacons Bank (Limited), the National Bank, the Metropolitan Bank (of England and Wales) (Limited), Lloyds Bank, the London and South-Western Bank, Cox and Co., Coutts and Co., Child and Co., C. Hoare and Co., Cocks, Biddulph, and Co., and the London and Provincial Bank (Limited). That is a remarkable document, which ought certainly to receive considerable attention. I hope the Government will take care that the Bill shall pass, and shall not be lost again at the end of the session. It deals with a very serious and crying evil, which, by the confession of all persons, requires remedy. I will only add that every session I receive additional evidence of the extraordinary degree to which this evil of corrupt commissions is increasing in every department of the State. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

*LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, I only rise to say that the letter to which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has referred is signed by every one of the clearing bankers of London. I would add also that it contains a paragraph to which the Lord Chancellor did not allude, and which expresses our thanks to him for having on more than one occasion carried the Bill through the House of Lords, and for other services rendered to the commercial community.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I should like to be allowed, on behalf of those who do not possess the technical weight and authority of the bankers of London, to say that the Bill has the support of a great many people outside the ranks of business men, who are desirous of promoting a reform urgently needed in the interests of the general morality and well-being of the country. I earnestly hope the Bill will be placed on the Statute-book this session.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, this Bill has also been through your Lordships' House. It is a very small measure, and its object is to enable a married woman who is a trustee or executor to act with the same efficiency as a *femme sole*, some ingenious persons having raised a doubt as to the efficiency of married women as trustees under the present law. There is in the minds of learned persons considerable doubt on the point, and this Bill has been prepared to put an end to that doubt.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, this is a Bill to amend the law relating to the administration of oaths for the purpose of proceedings in Prize Courts. It provides that there shall be added to Section 4 of the Commissioners for Oaths Act, 1889, which relates to the appointment of persons to administer oaths in prize proceedings, a provision that officers on board any of His Majesty's ships shall, whilst on the high seas or out of His Majesty's dominions, by virtue of their office, be empowered to administer oaths and take affidavits for any purpose relating to proceedings in any Prize Court.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

NAVAL PRIZE BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, this is also a Bill of a purely technical character. It affects no great principle of law, and is merely for the purpose of consolidating, with Amendments, the enactments relating to naval prize of war.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."--(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 13*th March*, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

The Earl of Halsbury.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 62 has been complied with, viz. :—Great Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Brentwood Gas Bill; Chelsea Electricity Supply Bill; Seaham Gas Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Ulster and Connaught Light Railways Bill (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

NORWICH UNION LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY [STAMP DUTIES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the chair].

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Society certain property, there be charged a Stamp Duty of five pounds, and such Duty shall be impressed upon the copy of the intended Act to be delivered to the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the section of this Act the marginal note whereof is 'Copy of Act to be registered.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked what was the estimated amount of the stamp duty which it was proposed to compound for the sum of five pounds. And further, he would like to know what was to become of the five pounds? Would it be applied to the reduction of debt or would it go into the ordinary revenue of the year?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.) said he was not aware that this question would arise, but he would communicate with the hon. Member the result of the inquiries he would undertake to make. He might explain that the composition of five pounds had been made in place of the stamp duty of ten shillings on every separate deed. The arrangement was a satisfactory one to all the parties concerned, including the Exchequer, and there would be no loss of revenue.

MR. WHITLEY reminded the hon. Gentleman that this stage had been twice postponed in order to get information from the Treasury. He thought it was important they should know what they were losing and what was to be done with the five pounds.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE (Norwich) thought they might be content to let this matter go before the Committee. The question, as the hon. Member knew, was one which touched on the fringe of revenue and hence the necessity for this stage. A clause of this nature could not be put into the Bill by the promoters. They were bound to get the sanction of the Treasury. After all, this was only a formal stage, the clause could be dealt with by the Committee upstairs, and, if necessary, when the Bill came back to the House the point could be again raised. The completion of this stage would not in any way hamper the Committee upstairs.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) could not agree that this was a formal stage. It was a stage rendered necessary by the Standing Orders of the House, and he thought the questions put by the hon. Member for Halifax were extremely proper. They ought to have information on the points raised and they ought to know what was to be foregone in return for the composition.

And it being quarter past Three of the clock the debate stood adjourned.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday (Evening Sitting).

METROPOLITAN POLICE PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL

Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Knutsford, against; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petition from Jarrow, against; to lie upon the Table.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petition from Kirkcaldy, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.

Account [presented 1st June, 1904] to be printed. [No. 79.]

REDISTRIBUTION OF THE FLEET.

Copy presented, of Statement of Arrangements consequent on the Redistribution of the Fleet [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1904, amending Statute III. ("The Fellows") of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 80.]

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD.

Copy presented, of First Annual Report of the Metropolitan Water Board for the year ending 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (HALF-YEARLY STATEMENTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th February; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 81.]

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Copy presented, of Thirteenth Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Inspection Committee for the year ended 20th November, 1904, with Appendices [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 82.]

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).

Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Colonial) Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, 1905, dated 28th February, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Clay Cross Railway (Abandonment) Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158b]; referred to the Committee on the Bill.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Appointment of Irish Magistrates.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether it is competent for the memorialists who approached the Duke of Abercorn with respect to the appointment of Catholic magistrates to the petty sessions bench of Pettigo, and whose memorial was not acknowledged by the Duke of Abercorn, to approach the Lord Chancellor of Ireland directly on this matter; and whether it is competent for the Lord Chancellor to appoint to the Commission of the Peace persons of whose competence to discharge magisterial functions he may be satisfied, even although such persons be not recommended to him by the lieutenant of the county.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Answer is in the affirmative to both Questions. I am not aware if the communication alluded to has been addressed to the Duke of Abercorn. The Lord Chancellor always considers most carefully all recommendations, and, according to practice, consults the lieutenant of the county on the subject.

Loan Expenditure on Naval Works.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can now state the estimated amount of Loan Expenditure on Naval Works during the ensuing year.

(*Answered by Mr. Arthur Lee.*) This amount cannot be stated, as the Naval Works Loan Bill is still under consideration.

Repair of Rotten Row.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether, in view of the condition of the ride of Rotten Row, especially that portion of it lying east of the barracks, and of the long period during which this ride has been neglected, he can give an assurance that it will be now put into and kept in complete order by the remaking of the roadway, and by the allocation to it of a sufficient staff to keep it drained and in repair; and whether he can arrange that some sum, corresponding to the £4,000 recently spent on replacing over an acre of grass in the Green Park by a broad path leading no whither, can now be expended on Rotten Row.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The First Commissioner regrets that he is unable to give any assurance that the foundations of the ride in question will be remade this year, though he is anxious to do all in his power, by placing fresh sand, to improve its condition. The Answer to the concluding paragraph is in the negative.

Disturbances in the Bahr-el-Ghazal.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Government have any information concerning troubles in the Bahr-el-Ghazal with the Azande tribe; and whether the Azandes are receiving, or have received, supplies of quick-firing rifles and ammunition through the territory of the Congo Free State.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The hon. Member presumably refers to the Niam-Niam tribe in the Azandi country. A patrol sent through that country by the Soudanese Government has encountered slight opposition from the chief of the tribe, but the matter does not appear of any material importance. As regards the second paragraph of the Question, we have received no such information.

Building of Forts in the Congo Free State.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has any official information as to the building of forts in Congo Free State territory near the boundary line dividing the Congo Free State from British territory in East Africa and on the Upper Nile, the accumulation of military stores, and the increase of Congolese troops at various strategic points along these frontiers; and, if so, whether he will present it to the House.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) His Majesty's Government have no information on the subject to present to the House.

Alleged Outrage by Turkish Troops at Kuklish, Salonica.

SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in possession of any information relating to the recent misconduct of Turkish troops in the village of Kuklish in the vilayet of Salonica; whether he is aware that out of 140 houses forty-three have been burnt and a large number looted; and whether any report has been received from His Majesty's Consul at Salonica as to the number of those massacred or violated by the Turkish troops.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) In reply to the hon. Member's Question and the Question which stands in the name of the hon. Member for Tyneside, it appears from a narrative supplied by a Russian *gendarmerie* officer, who was present during the later phases of the conflict, that the numbers of casualties and houses burnt are correctly stated; but we expect shortly to be in possession of further details of the occurrence, as an inquiry has been held on the spot by the Russian Adjoint, the secretaries of the Austrian and Russian Civil Agents, and Colonel Ali Riza Bey, representing Hilmi Pasha. The revolutionary band, whose presence had been denied by the villagers when summoned to surrender them, escaped during the attack. The exact number of killed and wounded among the Turkish troops is not stated.

London Unemployed Committee — Suggested Grant from Imperial Exchequer.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the statement on Friday last by the Bishop of Stepney, to the effect that there is a danger of the work of the London Unemployed Committee, established under a scheme suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, being arrested for want of money; and, if so, whether he will recommend to the First Lord of the Treasury the desirableness of making a grant of money to this Committee from Imperial sources.

(*Answered by Mr. Grant Lawson.*) My right hon. friend has seen the letter from the Bishop of Stepney, which appeared in *The Times* on Friday last, and hopes that the result of the appeals made by him and others for additional subscriptions may be to provide the Central Committee with the funds which they require. My right hon. friend fears that he could not promise to make any such recommendation as that suggested by the hon. Member; but, as he stated in reply to a previous Question † from him, he has been expecting some further information from the Committee as to their financial position. I understand that this will be furnished almost immediately.

Privacy of Income-Tax Returns.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, are the income-tax returns made by private individuals and companies treated as entirely confidential by the Income-Tax Commissioners, or are they allowed to be inspected by, or is information extracted from them given to any other person, official or otherwise; are the officers of the Estate Duty Department allowed to obtain information regarding the income of private persons or companies from the returns made to, or the assessments made by, the Income-Tax Commissioners; if so, will he state all the officials who are allowed access to the information; and will he further state whether there is any, and, if so, what, statutory authority for the disclosure of income-tax accounts.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1177.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The Board of Inland Revenue do not consider that any use they may make of income-tax returns within their own Department, and for their own official use, constitutes a disclosure of such returns within the meaning of the provisions of the law relating to secrecy in income-tax matters. Care is taken, however, that only responsible officers should have cognisance of such matters.

Barrack Accommodation in North China.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has now received the replies to the inquiries he promised should be made as to the character of the barrack accommodation in Northern China and the health of the officers and troops; whether he will furnish a Return of the various reports made by medical and other inspecting officers as to the accommodation provided for our troops in Northern China; and how much of the money taken in the Army Estimates last year for the improvement of this accommodation at Pekin and Shan-hai-kwan has been expended.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) I have received a Report on the barrack accommodation in North China. As regards the last part of the Question, about £9,000 of the money voted for Pekin will be spent this year, but the money provided for Shan-hai-kwan will not be spent.

Derrylaur

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of statutable acres in the electoral division of Derrylaur, in the Loughrea Union; whether he will state when this district was last visited by an inspector of the Congested Districts Board; what recommendations, if any, were made by the inspector at the time, and have they been given effect to; and whether, in view of the poverty of this mountain district, he will state the total expenditure of the Congested Districts Board upon works of utility in this district.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The area of this electoral division is 10,088 acres; it contains only 88 inhabited houses. The division has not been inspected by an officer of the Board since 1893. His report is a confidential document, and I cannot disclose its contents. There has been no expenditure by the Board in the division. In 1897 they offered to contribute one-half the cost of constructing a road, estimated at £900, but the local authority did not accept the offer.

Irish Education—New Rules.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the effect on boys' schools in Ireland of the rules of the Commissioners of Education, by which boys under eight years of age are ineligible for enrolment in a boys' school unless there is an assistant-mistress on the staff; and whether, in view of this fact, he will have these rules superseded.

MR. P. A. McHUGH (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many men teachers is the new rule of the National Board (127b) likely to throw out of employment, and how many to place on reduced salaries; do the Commissioners intend that the rule shall apply to teachers in the service at present; and, in the event of the amalgamation of small schools, will the principal teachers of such schools, when reduced in rank, be allowed the salaries and pension rights previously held by them.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) It is not practicable to reply to these Questions to-day, as the inquiries that are being made are not yet complete. I would ask the hon. Members to postpone them until Thursday next.

Irish Education—Issue of New Rules.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the Commissioners of National Education intend to issue their new rules.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The rules are now being issued.

Disestablishment of Police Barracks at Kildalkey.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the police barracks at Kildalkey, county Meath, are to be disestablished; and, if so, will he state the reason; and what is the number of offences reported for the sub-districts of Ballivor, Killyon, Stirrupstown, Lisclogher, and Kildalkey for the past three years; whether a memorial, signed by persons of all creeds and classes, has been received by the Lord-Lieutenant against any disestablishment of the barracks at Kildalkey; and, if so, what was the district inspector's report on the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) It has been decided to disestablish the police stationed at Kildalkey. There are four other stations within a radius of six miles, and the authorities are satisfied that the requirements of the locality can be adequately met by the police at these stations. The offences reported during the past three years from the sub-districts named numbered 133, 80, 43, 36, and 162 respectively, all of which, with five exceptions, were minor offences. Representations have been made against the removal of the police from Kildalkey. The reports made by the district inspector and other officers of the force are confidential documents.

The late W. T. Galway's Estate.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been directed to the estate of William Thomas Galway, deceased, situated in the county of Galway, and now for sale in the Land Judge's Court; and whether they have made a request under the Land Purchase Act of 1903 to the Land Judge for the purchase of this estate; and, if not, whether it is the intention of the Commissioners to do so and thus give the tenants an opportunity of becoming the owners of their farms.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) On the 2nd February the Commissioners issued to the Land Judge a request under the 7th Section of the Act with respect to this estate. The matter came before the Land Judge on the 7th instant, when directions were given to have the rental, which was settled many years ago, re-settled.

Submarine Mining Volunteer Corps.

Sir CHARLES PALMER (Durham, Jarrow): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the services of the Submarine Mining Volunteer Corps, for the protection of commercial harbours, have been dispensed with because of their having failed to carry out the duties and work assigned to them, or for other reasons not explained; and whether the corps will now become Royal Engineer Volunteer Corps.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) As I have already explained to the House, submarine mining in the estuaries and harbours of the United Kingdom will be discontinued. This step has been taken after full consultation with the Board of Admiralty, who consider that under existing conditions submarine mines are not necessary for purposes of defence, and may, in some cases, constitute a danger to our own vessels. It is obvious, therefore, that the reason which has led the War Office to dispense with the submarine miners is the impossibility of utilising their services, and is due to no want of appreciation of the excellence of the work of the past. The question of how the services of officers and men who have hitherto been engaged in submarine work could be best utilised is now receiving careful consideration.

Discharge of Employees in the Barracks Department.

General LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that notice of discharge has been given to employees in the Barracks Department on the ground that they formerly served in the Army; and whether, in carrying out the policy of placing the department under a civilian head, it is also his decision that men who have served their country as soldiers are disqualified for employment in this department.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Works under the Military Works Loans are reaching completion at twenty stations on or before the 31st March next. A considerable amount of the work done under these loans is carried out by temporary employees, and accordingly a number of these will no longer be required. The reply to both points raised in the Question is in the negative.

Ex-soldiers in Government Offices.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he has noted the statement of the Director of Recruiting that only nine posts have been filled during the year in Government offices, exclusive of the War Office, by soldiers, while the number of ex-soldiers employed in departments under Government shows considerable diminution; and what he proposes to do in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) As regards the smallness of the number of vacancies as messenger in Government offices, other than the War Office, which have been filled by pensioners, the matter is at present receiving very careful consideration. As regards the diminution of the number of ex-soldiers employed in departments under the War Office, to which the Question apparently refers, I must point out that, owing to the decrease of work in these departments since the cessation of the recent war, there has been a corresponding decrease in available employment.

Trainfield Gate, Victoria Barracks, Belfast.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will explain for what reason, and by whose instructions, has the Trainfield Gate, in connection with Victoria Barracks, Belfast, been closed; whether, in view of the fact that residents in the barracks have used the Trainfield Gate for years for the purpose of buying necessaries, he will direct the use of this gate as heretofore.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) My hon. friend has been somewhat misinformed. The general officer commanding reports that liquor only is not permitted to be brought into the barracks through the Trainfield Gate by soldiers or their families.

The Royal Horse Artillery.

GENERAL LAURIE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether a regulation is now in force prescribing that after five years service in that rank a subaltern officer of the Royal Field Artillery cannot be appointed to serve with the Royal Horse Artillery; whether a further regulation exists that an officer who has not served in Royal Horse Artillery as a subaltern cannot be appointed as captain or major to Royal Horse Artillery; whether he is aware that, owing to the practical stoppage of promotion in the Royal Artillery since the South African War, officers who were on active service with field batteries during that war, and were thus precluded from obtaining appointments to Royal Horse Artillery, have now completed five years service and are thus, under above rules, precluded from appointment to Royal Horse Artillery; and whether he will, under the circumstances, not enforce the prohibition against these officers serving in the higher ranks when through the exigencies of active service they have been prevented from serving as subalterns with Royal Horse Artillery.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) It has been the rule for many years that subalterns should not be appointed to the Horse Artillery after completion of five years service. Officers who have been passed over as subalterns for this reason are not, however, debarred from appointment in the next rank. There is no intention, therefore, of precluding such officers as those alluded to in the last part of the Question from appointment to Horse Artillery hereafter, provided that they are in every other way qualified.

Building of Married Soldiers' Quarters at Woolwich.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War when the building of the married soldiers' quarters, Artillery Place, Woolwich, for which the House has voted the money, will be commenced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The scheme is being pressed forward with a view to commencing building operations early in the summer.

Military Manœuvres in Ireland on St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that on last St. Patrick's Day, which is in Ireland a religious festival and a statutory national holiday, there was a field day for the garrisons of Newbridge, Kildare, and the Curragh, the Catholic troops being thus unable to assist at divine service and the inhabitants of the area covered by those operations being put to inconvenience; and whether steps will be taken in future that field days will be fixed on days other than St. Patrick's Day or other Catholic holidays.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The responsibility for the training and exercise of the troops in Ireland rests with the General Commanding-in-Chief there, and it is not desirable to interfere with his discretion in these matters. I will, however, under the special circumstances bring this particular matter to his notice.

War Office and Treasury—Jam Contracts for South Africa.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the Comptroller and Auditor-General of Public Accounts addressed inquiries to the War Office on the 26th April, 1904, to ascertain what were the terms of the contracts for the supply of jam to the War Office for South Africa; what examination had been made to insure that full contract weights were delivered; and whether a reported deficiency of 337,704 lbs. was investigated by a Court of inquiry and reported to the Treasury; and that the War Office neglected for more than ten months to reply to the Auditor-General's inquiries; and whether any reply has in fact yet been furnished; and, if so, what is the nature of the reply.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) This Question deals with a matter arising from the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General on the accounts for 1903–4. These matters will come before the Public Accounts Committee, and I am not, therefore, prepared to discuss them at the present time.

Colonial Marriage With a Deceased Wife's Sister.

General LAURIE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received any communication from any of the self-governing Colonies urging the legalisation in the United Kingdom of marriages lawfully contracted in other parts of the Empire; and, if so, whether he proposes any action.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I can only refer the hon. and gallant Member to the Answer given by the Prime Minister to a similar Question asked on the 20th February †.

Security for Lagos Government Inscribed Stock.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, is the Imperial Government responsible for interest and principal on the Lagos Government 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock; and whether, seeing that the security for the loan, principal and interest, is the surplus revenue of the Lagos Government, and in view of the proportion of that revenue derived from the import of gin and rum, will he say what steps have been taken to secure the loan in the event of the duties on gin and rum being largely increased or restriction imposed upon the sale of the same to natives.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) With regard to the first part of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to the prospectus of the loan, from which he will also perceive that the loan is secured on the general revenues and assets of the Colony. No steps such as are indicated by the hon. Member have been taken or are necessary or usual. Both the expenditure of the Colony and the taxation from which the revenue is derived are subject to the sanction of the Secretary of State. If the revenue received from the import duties on gin and rum should be reduced from any cause, there is no reason whatever to suppose that the Colony will not be able to meet its obligations by obtaining the requisite amount from other sources or by reducing its expenditure if necessary.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 620.

Transvaal Contribution and Profits of Premier Mine.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, seeing that the profits derived by the Transvaal Government from the Premier Mine will be more than sufficient to meet the interest and sinking fund on the first £10,000,000 of the Transvaal contribution, he will say whether the mineowners have represented to Lord Milner that the floating of this loan was inopportune till the revenues from the Premier Mine would meet the interest and sinking fund on such loan; and, if so, whether he will lay upon the Table the despatches he has received from Lord Milner bearing on this question of the revenues of the Premier Mine in respect to the financial position of the Transvaal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have no information as to any such representations having been made to Lord Milner.

The Premier Mine.

MR. MARKHAM: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the directors of the Premier Mine have entered into an agreement with a Mr. S. Neumann, a director of the Premier Mine, giving this gentleman the sale of all diamonds found in the Premier Mine; and whether, seeing this gentleman is associated in business with the directors of the De Beers Mine, a competing company, he will say what steps, if any, he proposes taking to safeguard the interests of the Transvaal Government in connection with the sale of these diamonds.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have received no information to this effect.

Alleged Outrage by Turkish Troops at Kuklish.

MR. HUGH SMITH (Northumberland, Tyneside): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government has received any official information to the effect that on 16th February the village of Kuklish, near Strouhnitza, was sacked and burned by Turkish troops; that while an insurgent band of twelve men was allowed to escape from the village thirty-six villagers and one girl were massacred and many women violated; and, if so, whether he proposes to make any representations on the subject.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) In reply to the hon. Member's Question, and the Question which stands in the name of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Walsall, it appears from a narrative supplied by a Russian *gendarmerie* officer, who was present during the later phases of the conflict, that the numbers of casualties and houses burnt are correctly stated; but we expect shortly to be in possession of further details of the occurrence, as an inquiry has been held on the spot by the Russian Adjoint, the secretaries of the Austrian and Russian Civil Agents, and Colonel Ali Riza Bey, representing Hilmi Pasha. The revolutionary band, whose presence had been denied by the villagers when summoned to surrender them, escaped during the attack. The exact number of killed and wounded among the Turkish troops is not stated.

Physical Condition of School Children.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the attention of the Board of Education has been directed to the evidence given in December, 1903, by Dr. Eichholz, one of their inspectors, before the Committee on Physical Deterioration, in which he testifies that in a school in Lambeth he considered 90 per cent. of the children unable, by reason of their physical condition, to attend to the duties of the school in a proper way; that in a school in West Ham he found in a similar condition, 87 per cent. of the infants, and 77 per cent. of the elders; in a school in Manchester, 66 per cent.; in another Manchester school, 60 per cent. of the infants, 44 per cent. in the lower standards, and 27 per cent. in the upper standards; and in many schools in other towns a considerable, though less, proportion; and what steps the Board of Education have taken to prevent the waste of public money involved in providing instruction for children thus unfit to receive it.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) I have carefully read the evidence referred to, and have myself visited the Lambeth school referred to in the Question. The right hon. Member is probably aware that there are very wide differences of opinion as to the extent of the evil complained of, and the remedies to be applied. A Departmental Committee has been appointed by the Lord President for the purpose of providing useful and precise information on the subject.

Post Office and National Telephone Company—Transfer of Staff.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the wording of the purchase agreement between the Government and the National Telephone Company in relation to the staff of the company is causing uncertainty amongst the employees and may check the entrance of qualified candidates, during the next seven years, thus affecting the efficiency of a future Government service, he can give any definite assurance that the members of the staff will be taken into the Government service upon the transfer in 1911 provided by the agreement.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) When, as provided by the agreement, the National Telephone Company's system is purchased in 1911 it will be necessary for the Post Office to provide a staff to carry on the service. It seems probable, therefore, that employment will be offered to qualified members of the National Telephone Company's staff whose services are necessary for that purpose. The reasonable probability of employment in the Post Office service with its many advantages will, I feel sure, be sufficient to attract qualified candidates during the next seven years; and I am convinced that any definite assurance or undertaking given now as to the transfer of staff or the conditions of service under the Post Office would be found very embarrassing by my successor in 1911.

Pay of Post Office (Provincial) Night Messengers.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in considering the claims of the provincial night messengers, the scale of pay of the night messengers at Sheffield and Hull at present in force will be taken into account as well as the advisability of awarding good conduct badges to messengers of approved service, or whether he will consider the question of establishing a scale of pay for these officials on a similar basis to that prevailing in the Customs service for watchers employed in somewhat similar duties as the night messengers.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The scale of pay for the adult night telegraph messengers at Sheffield and Hull is obsolete, and cannot, therefore, be taken into account as the hon. Member suggests. I see no reason for awarding good conduct stripes to provincial night telegraph messengers, but I am considering their rate of pay, and, if I find any change is necessary, I will announce it when I am able to state to the House my decision as regards other classes.

Appointment of Sub-Postmaster and Telegraph Extension, at Limerick.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the appointment to the sub-post office, Rutland Street, Limerick, has yet been filled; and, if so, by whom; will he say if the person appointed must have a knowledge of post office work; and whether consideration has yet been given to the memorial asking that telegraphic communication be made with the branch post office, William Street, Limerick.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The vacancy at the sub-post office at Rutland Street, Limerick, has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Patrick Webster. It is not essential that the person appointed should himself have a knowledge of post office work. Consideration is being given to the memorial asking for a telegraph extension to William Street, Limerick. I fear, however, that such an extension will not prove to be warranted.

Evicted Tenants in North Wexford.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he will state the number of evicted tenants in North Wexford in November, 1903; the number of cases settled since that date; the number of cases in process of settlement; and the amount of money granted to the evicted tenants whose cases have been settled up to the present in North Wexford.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The Estates Commissioners have received application from 192 persons claiming reinstatement as evicted tenants in this county since the passing of The Irish Land Act, 1903. The applications are not tabulated according to Parliamentary divisions. Of these 192 persons, five are outside the scope of the provisions of the Act. The Commissioners have reinstated thirty-seven in their former or new holdings, and it is hoped to reinstate six others at an early date. The landlords have, it is understood, restored some thirty or more evicted tenants. The Commissioners have advanced sums amounting to £3,674 for the improvement of the holdings of reinstated tenants in the county.

Land Commission Appeals in Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he will state whether any steps will be taken by the Land Commission to hold a sitting for the hearing of appeals at an early date in Longford; and, if so, when.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) A sitting will be held at Longford on the 30th May next

Illegal Trawling off the Isle of May.

CAPTAIN ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Lord-Advocate whether, in view of the destruction to the gear of fishermen which has been caused during the past two months by trawlers that have been trawling in prohibited waters off the Isle of May, the cruiser "Brenda" will be stationed more continuously off the Isle of May; and whether he will reconsider the advisability of making arrangements whereby the lightkeepers on the Isle of May might report to the police authorities cases of illegal trawling coming under their notice.

(*Answered by Mr. Scott Dickson.*) The Secretary for Scotland has drawn the attention of the Fishery Board to the matter referred to by the hon. Member, and has requested them to instruct that these waters should be as closely patrolled as duties on other parts of the coast permit. He will communicate with the Northern Lights Commissioners with reference to the latter part of the Question.

One-man Companies and Poison Regulations.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to a recent judgment in the Cardiff County Court in which it was revealed that a one-man company incorporated under the Companies Acts cannot be punished for any disregard of the poison regulations sanctioned by the Privy Council; and whether, in the public interest, the Departmental Committee of Inquiry on the Companies Acts will be directed to consider and report on this effect of incorporation.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) My attention has not been called to the recent judgment in the Cardiff County Court referred to in the Question. The Board of Trade are not prepared to direct the Departmental Committee of Inquiry on the Companies Acts to consider and report on the sale of poisons by one-man or other companies, inasmuch as any amendment of the law in this respect would not be germane to a Companies Bill.

Joint Stock Companies—Case of Attorney-General v. Appleton.

SIR JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the decision of the Master of the Rolls in the High Court of Justice in Ireland (Chancery Division) in the case of the Attorney-General *v.* Appleton and others; and whether the Board of Trade proposes to take any action in reference to that decision with a view to preventing in Great Britain such abuses of the Companies Acts as were disclosed in the course of the proceedings.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) My attention has been called to the decision in the case of the Attorney-General *v.* Appleton. The Board of Trade are at the present moment taking the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown with regard to the instructions to be given by the Board of Trade to the Registrars of Joint Stock Companies in England, Scotland, and Ireland as to the registration of dentist companies.

Removal of Wreck off Blackwater, County Wexford.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state who is the harbour or conservancy authority or the general lighthouse authority for the district whose duty it is to remove the wreck of the "Albert," which lies off Blackwater, in the county of Wexford.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am informed that this vessel was wrecked some fifty or sixty years ago, and a few remaining portions of her lie within 200 yards of the shore, inside the limits of jurisdiction of the Wexford Harbour Commissioners, who have power under Section 530 of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, to remove or destroy any vessel that may be sunk in the harbour or tidal water under their control in such manner as in their opinion to be an obstruction or danger to navigation or to lifeboats engaged in lifeboat service.

Outside Employment of Medical Officers of Local Government Board.

MR. CROOKS: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the medical inspectors of the Local Government Board are permitted to accept appointments for pay outside their official duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Grant Lawson.*) A medical inspector is required to devote the whole of his official time to the duties of his office; but this is not intended to interfere with the manner in which he employs the rest of his time or his holidays.

Accidents caused by Gas coming in Contact with Leakage of Electric Current.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the number of accidents reported by the police during the last three years as having occurred in the streets of the Metropolis through gas escaping into a telegraph inspection chamber and coming into contact with leakage in an electric wire; and will he state whether such accidents are brought under the notice of the Postmaster-General with a view to the insulation of the electric wires, or such other preventive measures as may be deemed prudent.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) During the three years ending on 31st December, 1904, the Metropolitan police reported six explosions as having been caused by gas escaping into a telegraph inspection chamber and coming into contact with a leakage in an electric wire; and a seventh case, in which a similar explosion of gas in a telegraph inspection chamber was supposed to have been caused by a lighted match. In addition to these seven cases, the police reported twenty-three similar accidents in which explosions occurred through the accumulation of gas in electric light or supply boxes. It is the duty of the police to report such accidents at once to the Post Office authorities or to the electric supply companies, as the case may be.

Employment of Young Persons in Coal Mines.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has any information showing the number of young persons of sixteen and seventeen years of age employed underground in coal mines in the United Kingdom; and if he could furnish an approximate estimate of the number so employed in 1903 or 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The number of young persons under sixteen employed below ground in mines under the Coal Mines Act was, in 1903, 45,234; and in 1904, 44,628. I regret that I cannot give the number of persons between sixteen and seventeen so employed, as the returns which owners are required by the Act to make do not distinguish the ages over sixteen.

Precautions against Accidental Poisoning.

DR. MACNAMARA: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the number of deaths which have recently occurred through accidental poisoning; whether he is aware that a locking poison bottle has been recently invented by which, at a trifling cost, accidental poisoning can be prevented; and, if so, whether he will take steps to compel distributors of carbolic acid and other virulent poisons to refrain from selling poisons except in some kind of locked bottle.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) My attention has been drawn to several recent cases of accidental poisoning, and also to several inventions designed to minimise the risk of such accidents. Under the regulations made by the Pharmaceutical Society under Section 1 of the Pharmacy Act, 1868, and approved by the Privy Council, it is at the present time required that all liniments, embrocations, lotions, and liquid disinfectants containing poison must be sold in bottles rendered distinguishable by touch from ordinary medicine bottles, and that each such bottle must bear a label giving notice that its contents are not to be taken internally. The Lord President of the Council is of opinion that it would be undesirable to prescribe the use of any special form of bottle which might give a monopoly to the patentee, and further, that the inconvenience of a locked bottle might not improbably lead careless purchasers to transfer its contents into some ordinary vessel.

Promotion in the Customs Service.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Board of Customs by their General Order 78 of 1902, had granted an annual allowance of £15 as compensation for retardation of promotion to officers who served less than twelve years in the grade of outdoor officer prior to promotion to the rank of second-class examining officer; and, if so, whether he can state upon what grounds a similar allowance of £15 has been refused to those officers who joined the Customs service between 1885 and 1888, all of whom served as outdoor officers and assistants for twelve years and upwards before being promoted to the rank of second-class examining officer.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The condition of the two classes of officers referred to by the hon. Member is dissimilar. Officers who were appointed between 1885 and 1888 were in a position to forecast their prospects better than the entrants during and prior to 1883, who could not have foreseen that their promotion might be retarded by the warehousing changes effected in 1882 and 1883.

Irish Ancient Monuments—St. Mels Cathedral.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether there is now a prospect of the ancient ruins of St. Mels Cathedral at Ardagh being vested in the Board of Works for the purpose of protection under the Ancient Monuments Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I have nothing to add to the Answer given to the hon. Member on July 18th, 1903, on this matter. The circumstances therein described remain unaltered.

India—Case of Imperator v. A. C. Rolt.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether there will be placed before Parliament, at the earliest practicable date, a full report of the proceedings in the case Imperator v. A. C. Rolt, tried in the Calcutta High Court on 20th December, 1904, together with full particulars of the action taken in the early stages of the suit by the Collector of Purneah and the Commissioner of Bhagalpur

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am in communication with the Government of India with regard to this matter, and I do not at present see any sufficient reason for laying Papers regarding it before Parliament.

Relief Works in County Galway.

Mr. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number and character of the relief works now in operation in the Clifden and Oughterard Unions, county Galway; the number of men employed in each case, the number of supervisors, inspectors, gangmen, and others engaged, and the rate of wages paid to the labourers and the others; and whether the men relieved by these works are thereby disfranchised.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*)

Clifden Union.

Number of Relief Works in Operation.	Number of Workers Authorised.	Supervisors.		Paymasters.		Gangers or Timekeepers.	
		Number.	Weekly Wages of Each.	Number.	Weekly Wages of Each.	Number.	Weekly Wages of Each.
10	157	4	£1	4	£1 10s.	10	10s.

Oughterard Union.

Number of Relief Works in Operation.	Number of Workers Authorised.	Supervisors.		Paymasters.		Gangers or Timekeepers.	
		Number.	Weekly Wages of Each.	Number.	Weekly Wages of Each.	Number.	Weekly Wages of Each.
16	394	5	£1	2	£3	16	10s.

The works which are at present being undertaken consist of road construction and repairs. The wages paid to labourers are at the rate of six shillings a week. The Local Government Board have been advised that the recipients of exceptional relief under Section 13 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, are not thereby disfranchised, but in order to remove any doubt on the subject provision will be made in the Seed and Distress Bill exempting such recipients from any electoral disability.

Irish National Teachers' Salaries.

Mr. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that many of those Queen's scholars who were in training at the time of the abolition of the results system got notifications from the Pension Office to the effect that they were recognised as second-class teachers, and, as such, are subjected to the stoppage of this class for the Pension Fund; that they are now paid third-grade salary; that, in the year 1900, the words "Special Distinction" were marked on the pass papers of those candidates who obtained sixty-five per cent. of answering; that these teachers are in first division of second class, and therefore rank higher than third grade; and whether the remuneration will be increased accordingly.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The system of promotion of teachers by examination and classification was abolished from the 1st April, 1900. But teachers already "classed" were allowed to retain their classification, and others who at the time were seeking promotion in classification either by undergoing a course of training or through efficient service extending over a number of years, were granted special consideration when the amounts of their consolidated salaries were being fixed. In some cases where the teachers had already qualified for promotion in classification on or before the 1st April, 1900, or were then completing service that would qualify them for higher classification, the promotions were granted subsequently by the Board, and the Pensions Office was duly advised. But it did not follow as a necessary consequence of such promotion in classification that the teachers concerned should get a corresponding promotion in gradation, classification and gradation being very different things. There are very many teachers in the service whose classification is higher than their gradation, and there is a considerable number whose gradation is higher than their classification. The remuneration of teachers under the present system of payments depends entirely on their "gradation," and though the classification of a teacher may be a not unimportant element in the determination of a teacher's gradation, it is only one of such elements.

Teacher's Residence attached to St. James' National School at Athboy (County Meath).

MR. P. A. McHUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in connection with the residence attached to St. James' Mixed National School, Athboy, county Meath, no outlet was provided in the Board of Works' plans for surface water, although the residence is surrounded by high ground; that, as a consequence, the foundations sank immediately after the residence was built, and the house had to be rebuilt at the expense of the manager; and whether, seeing that the manager was refused any aid by the Commissioners, although he offered to bear a reasonable proportion of the cost, and that this site has been condemned by the medical officer of health as insanitary from want of drainage, he will say what steps he means to take to have the site put into a sanitary condition.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) This Question is based on a misapprehension of the functions and responsibilities of the Board of Works in respect to the erection of teachers' residences out of moneys advanced by the Board. In such cases typical plans are supplied by the Board to borrowers, but the special plans to meet individual cases are prepared, not by the Board, but by the architects employed by the borrower. The borrower also provides the site, selects the contractor, and arranges for the supervision of the work. The responsibility for efficient work in connection with the erection of the residences rests entirely with the borrower. The maximum loan allowable under the regulations has been granted in the present instance, and it is not practicable to give further aid towards these houses.

The Volunteer Force.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many resignations of officers and of non-commissioned officers and privates have been received from the Volunteer Force between October 1st, 1904, to December 31st, 1904; and how the numbers compare with those in the same period of the preceding year; and how many officers were appointed and how many recruits joined within the same time in each of the two years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The figures are as follow:—

	1st October, 1903, to 31st December, 1903.	1st October, 1904, to 31st December, 1904.
Resignations of combatant officers -	363	372
Number of combatant officers who joined - - - - - -	286	244
Total number of officers and men, all arms, returned as having "voluntarily quitted" - -	23,290	18,024
Total number of officers and men, joined, whether as recruits or with previous service in Army or Auxiliary Forces - - -	12,775	10,173

Army Recruiting and Pay.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the Secretary of State for War what was the length of Colour service, Reserve service, and pay in the Regular Army in 1895; what have been the changes since in service, both Colour and Reserve, and pay; also the number of recruits enlisted each year since that date.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) I cannot undertake within the limits of a reply to a Question to give the hon. Member the full information for which he asks. As regards the Colour and Reserve service, and the number of recruits enlisted, he will find full information in the General Annual Report of the British Army in Part III. Table 6, for the years up to 1902, and including nine months of 1903, and in the Annual Report of the Director of Recruiting and Organisation for 1903–4. The General Annual Report for 1904 will be very shortly published. As regards the pay, the figures for the infantry will doubtless serve the hon. Member's purpose, and are as follows:—The pay of a private of infantry of the Line in 1895 was:—Regimenta pay, 1s. a day; deferred pay, on completion of Colour service, £3 a year; good conduct pay, 1d. after two years, 2d. after six years; Reserve pay, 6d. a day. The following alterations have since been made:—From 1st April, 1898, messing allowance of 3d. a day was added, and a gratuity of £1 for each year's service substituted for the deferred pay of £3. From 1st April, 1902, kit allowance of 2d. a day was given to cover various stoppages, and men who after two years service extend their Colour service from three to eight years were granted service pay at rates varying from 4d. to 7d. a day. Good conduct pay was abolished. The actual payments of service pay began on 1st April, 1904.

Strength of Militia.

Mr. LAMBERT: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the strength, excluding permanent staff, of officers and men, respectively, serving in the Militia at the commencement of the years 1899 to 1905 inclusive.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The figures are as follows:—

	Officers.	Non-commissioned Officers and Men.	Total.
1899 - - - - -	2,924	103,647	106,571
1900 - - - - - -	2,744	98,130	100,874
1901 - - - - - -	3,033	92,741	95,774
1902 - - - - -	2,688	102,845	105,533
1903 - - - - -	2,919	102,420	105,339
1904 - - - -	2,713	90,909	93,622
1905 - - - - -	2,577	88,282	90,859

Schools of Instruction for Volunteer Officers.

Mr. PARTINGTON (Derbyshire, High Peak): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state where schools of instruction for Volunteer officers are held, and the regulations and conditions of attendance attached to them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The schools of instruction for Volunteer officers and the regulations governing attendance at them are laid down in the Volunteer Regulations. As regards infantry officers, the approved stations for the schools referred to in the regulations are London, Preston, Lichfield, Glasgow, and Edinburgh. The instructions for the courses for 1905 will be found in Army Orders for December, 1904.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Anchorages for Disused Ironclads in the Clyde.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty who was the official employed to report on the alternative anchorages for the disused ironclads recommended by the Clyde Yacht Clubs; and whether he will lay upon the Table particulars of the report which induced the Admiralty to retain the vessels in their present positions.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The Admiralty has acted on the advice of its professional officers and is alone responsible. It is neither usual nor desirable to comply with the request contained in the latter part of the hon. Member's Question.

DR. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye): If it is necessary to have this "Rotten Row" why not have it at Felixstowe?

[No Answer was returned.]

Non-effective War Ships.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the Dockyard Expenses Account, 1903–4, to which reference is made in Return No. 74 of vessels struck off the effective list, is not yet issued; and will he state the number and names of the vessels in the above Return which would come under the heading, in former Dockyard Expenses Accounts, "ships unfit for service and ordered to be sold."

MR. PRETYMAN: The Dockyard Expense Accounts, 1903–4, will be in the hands of hon. Members on Wednesday next. The number of vessels included in the Return which were classified in former Dockyard Expense Accounts (1902–3) as "unfit for service or ordered to be sold, &c.," is nineteen, and their names are as follows:—Amphion, Melita, Peacock, Pheasant, Pigeon, Ringdove, Flamingo, Iron Duke, Emerald (old), Widgeon (old), Dapper, Forte, Hector, Raleigh, Boadicea, Active, Pigmy, Fancy, and Swinger. These vessels were included in the previous Dockyard Expense Accounts under the heading mentioned, but their classification has since been amended as shown in Return No. 74.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether, in order to provide work for Englishmen, the Admiralty will arrange to have these ships broken up in this country?

MR. PRETYMAN: As far as possible that will be done.

MR. BUCHANAN: Then the headings of these accounts are being entirely altered.

MR. PRETYMAN: Yes, in the manner shown in the Return.

Sugar Convention—Russo-German Treaty.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that, under the new Russo-German Treaty, Russian sugar can be imported into Germany on paying a surtax of six francs the 100 kilos., and that surtax is sufficiently high to countervail the Russian bounty; that, under the same treaty, Russian sugar may be ground, coloured, repacked, and exported from Germany so long as the word Russia is placed on the packages; and, if so, whether it is necessary to put the word Russia on original packages, not repacked, on export from Germany; and, if not, what steps do the Government propose to take to prevent the importation of Russian sugar into the United Kingdom by way of Germany; whether the arrangements made between Russia and Germany have been agreed to by the British Government and by the Permanent Sugar Commission at Brussels; and, if not, whether they amount to a breach of the International Sugar Convention, which would justify the exclusion of German as well as Russian sugar from the United Kingdom.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The statement in the first part of the Question is without foundation. As regards the second part of the Question, the treaty provision to which I suppose allusion is made is that whereby Germany agrees to adopt no restrictive measures with regard to the importation of Russian sugar destined for re-exportation or the operations to which such sugar is allowed to be subjected in German ports. All sugar imported into this country has to be accompanied by a certificate of origin showing *inter alia* the country of production and origin, and signed by the fiscal authority having jurisdiction at the place of production, despatch, or transformation of the sugar. I am not in a position to give an interpretation of the effect of the treaty arrangements between Russia and Germany. Should the Permanent Commission consider that any steps taken by one of the contracting States infringe the Convention they would no doubt report accordingly.

MR. LOUGH: Is the import of Russian sugar for the purpose of re-exportation allowed into this country as well as Germany?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, it is not.

Sugar Freights on German Railways.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that immediately before or just after the Brussels Sugar Convention came into operation the rates of freight on German State railways were materially reduced, in order to partially make up to the German sugar producers for the removal of the sugar bounties; does such reduction amount to an indirect export bounty; and, if so, whether, under such circumstances, he proposes to exclude German sugar from this country.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: In the spring of 1904 the question of proposed reductions of sugar freights was considered by the Permanent Tariff Commission of the Prussian Railways, which reported against the proposal. Since then no change has been made.

Higher Education of Nurses.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the Board has received an application for a licence to incorporate a society for the higher education of nurses, from gentlemen unconnected with medicine or surgery; and, if so, do the Board still adhere to the view expressed in a letter written by the Board on August 6th, 1891, to Dr. Bedford Fenwick, in which it was stated that it appeared to the Board of Trade that they were not competent to determine the very important question connected with the establishment of a register of nurses, which should be settled before the register can be effectively established; and that, under the circumstances, the Board of Trade were unable to grant the desired licence to the Royal British Nurses' Association; and that the Board were convinced that full inquiry (by competent authorities) into all the facts and circumstances of the case, and into the objections that have been raised, should precede any further steps on the part of the Government; and whether, if any change has since taken place in the policy of the Board in dealing with the question of the registration of nurses, he can indicate the nature and grounds of such change.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: An application has been received by the Board of Trade for a licence to incorporate under Section 23 of the Companies Act, 1867, without the word "limited," a society for the higher education of nurses. The proposed memorandum and articles of association which have been submitted to the Board of Trade are subscribed by seven gentlemen, none of whom are members of the medical or surgical profession, one of whom, however, is the Chairman of a London hospital. The Board of Trade propose to hear both the applicants and the objectors to the grant of a licence, and until after such hearing do not propose to come to any decision as to policy or otherwise.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Has any change taken place since the decision of 1891, and if so, what?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think we consider ourselves bound by the decision of 1891.

Increase of Conventual and Monastic Institutions in Great Britain.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the influx of conventual and monastic institutions from France; whether there is any official record of their numbers; and whether the Government propose to take any steps to secure their inspection.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am aware that a considerable influx of these institutions has taken place, but there is no official record of their numbers. They are, of course, subject to the ordinary law of the land; and I am not aware that any special inspection is required.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman on what ground he bases his statement that there is no ground for special inspection?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I said that I am not aware that any special inspection is required. I would remind the hon. Gentleman that if these institutions require to be inspected they will be inspected under the ordinary law of the land.

MR. SLOAN: Has the right hon. Gentleman any knowledge that they are only religious institutions?

MR. T. L. CORBETT: May I ask whether conventual laundries are inspected under the ordinary law?

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been called to the influx of Scotch candidates into Welsh constituencies?

[No Answer was returned.]

Aliens in His Majesty's Prisons.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the number of aliens at present undergoing sentences in His Majesty's prisons in the United Kingdom; and how the figures compare with the four previous years.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The total number of convicted aliens received into prisons in England and Wales was, in the year 1899, 2,437; 1900, 2,761; 1901, 3,101; 1902, 3,845; 1903, 4,099. The figures for 1904 shall be sent to the hon. Member as soon as they are completed. To give the figures for a particular day would involve the collection of a special return, and they would be much less satisfactory, for purposes of comparison, than the total number received.

MR. LOUGH: Does this increase approximate to the general increase of crime in this country?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS asked for notice of that Question.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: Is it a fact there is a general increase of crime in this country?

[No Answer was returned.]

Sale of Poisons.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he proposes to introduce legislation this session to regulate the sale of poisons; and, in view of the deaths which have occurred through the taking of poisons by misadventure, notably a recent case in which a fatal dose of carbolic acid was administered to a patient under the impression that the bottle contained the prescribed medicine, will he take into consideration the advantage to be derived from a clause directing that all poisons shall be sold in bottles of a distinctive shape, so that the risk of bottles of poison being mistaken for medicine may be reduced to a minimum.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The Lord President of the Council has under his consideration the question of legislation on this subject, but I am not in a position to make any statement as to the introduction of a Bill. Under the Regulations made by the Pharmaceutical Society under Section 1 of the Pharmacy Act, 1868, and approved by the Privy

Council, it is at the present time required that all liniments, embrocations, lotions, and liquid disinfectants containing poison must be sold in bottles rendered distinguishable by touch from ordinary medicine bottles, and that each such bottle must bear a label giving notice that its contents are not to be taken internally.

Post Office Savings Bank—Registrar of Friendly Societies and Depositors.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the Registrar of Friendly Societies is empowered to compel the attendance of depositors in the Savings Bank to appear before him and answer for the means by which such deposits were procured; and further, seeing that this practice may entail serious expense and very often inconvenience on depositors, will he take steps to have this alleged grievance removed.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies is not under my control; and it is not, therefore, within my province to reply to the hon. Member's Question. I may say, however, that I am not aware of any suggestion for a cheaper or more convenient method of settling disputes between Savings Bank authorities and depositors than that at present in force.

Post Office Savings Bank—Depositors' Accounts.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General can he say under what statutory authority the Registrar of Friendly Societies is empowered to inspect the accounts of depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank; under what conditions is this inspection made, and are the whole of the accounts of Savings Bank depositors open to this inspection; are there any other authorities or persons who are allowed to inspect Savings Bank deposit accounts; and, if so, who are they; and can he assure the House that in future these accounts will be regarded as secret and confidential, and will not be permitted by him to be inspected by any other person than the depositor; or, in the alternative, will he undertake that they shall be open to inspection by all creditors of the depositor, or other persons having pecuniary interest in the inspection.

Lord STANLEY: Section 15 of the Savings Bank Act of 1844, which defines the powers with reference to Post Office Savings Bank matters which are now vested in the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies, authorises the inspection of any book or books relating to the matters in dispute. With the exception of the Assistant Registrars in Edinburgh and Dublin, who act on behalf of the Chief Registrar, no other authorities or persons are allowed to inspect Savings Bank deposit accounts, unless under the order of the Judge of some competent Court. The statutory obligation to treat depositors' accounts as secret and confidential will be carefully observed in future, as it is now, and as it has been in the past. The hon. Member's alternative suggestion is incompatible with the observance of this obligation, and I do not propose to adopt it.

The Postmaster-General and the Bradford Committee's Report.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the Postmaster-General in 1903 appointed a Committee, presided over by Sir E. Bradford, to investigate the question of wages amongst certain classes of postal workers, that an assurance was given that the composition of the Committee would command the confidence of the House as well as the general public, that the staff were asked in the official circular to give evidence before it, and that nearly two years have transpired since the original promise of the formation of the Committee was announced, he will, in view of the condition of unrest among the postal and telegraph staffs, and in the interest of the efficiency of the service, declare his intention of adopting, as dating from May, 1904, the whole of the remedial recommendations of the Bradford Committee.

Lord STANLEY: No, Sir. I have already announced publicly that I am not prepared to take the course suggested by the hon. Member; but I propose shortly to announce the changes in wages which I find to be justified. Provision is made for these changes in the Estimates for the coming financial year.

Mr. NANNETTI: Is the noble Lord aware that the seething discontent in the service is now aggravated by his announced intention to brush aside the Bradford Report? Can he not pledge himself to adopt that Report?

Lord STANLEY: No, I shall bring forward the scheme I feel justified in proposing.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): But will the noble Lord have regard to the recommendations of, and views expressed by, the Bradford Committee.

Lord STANLEY: No, I propose to bring out the scheme I think most desirable.

Dingwall Post Office.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the accommodation afforded at the Dingwall Post Office is altogether inadequate for the increasing postal and telegraph business; and will he consider the expediency of making arrangements for more commodious premises.

Lord STANLEY: There is no doubt that, although the accommodation for the public in the Dingwall Post Office is fairly good, the rest of the accommodation is rather cramped. I shall be glad to consider any offer of a suitable building or site for an enlarged office.

Inverpolly (Ross-shire) Letter Delivery.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether arrangements can be made for the delivery of letters in the township of Inverpolly, near Ullapool, Ross-shire.

Lord STANLEY: There is already a delivery at Inverpolly Lodge, but I find that at a shepherd's cottage three miles away no delivery is at present afforded. The amount of correspondence for this cottage is very small indeed, and as the cost of serving it would be 1s. 6d. on each occasion, I should not be justified in sending the postman there every time a letter arrived. If, however, a delivery once a fortnight would be acceptable, I will give instructions for such a service to be afforded.

Girls Public Day School Company.

Sir GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that the net profits of the Girls Public Day School Company for 1904 was £9,327 or over 7 per cent. on the capital, and that of this profit £4,200 was received from Imperial taxation, out of grants from the Education Department; and whether, seeing that he stated on the 26th July, 1904, that these grants would be discontinued after July, 1904, he is aware that the fees of the pupils in those schools average £15 a year per pupil; and whether, if these grants are to be continued to pay dividends on educational joint stock companies, they are to be given also to all other private adventure schools for the children of well-to-do parents.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): As regards the first part of the Question, I may remind the hon. Member that by their articles of association the Girls Public Day School Company are not allowed to pay a dividend of more than 4 per cent. All profits beyond this amount go for educational purposes. As regards the second part of the Question, I can assure the hon. Member that no grants will under any circumstances be paid after the end of the current educational year to the schools conducted by this company or any other similar body, unless they can so alter their constitution as to come within the present requirements of the Board.

Sir GEORGE BARTLEY: Is it not the fact that although they only paid 4 per cent. dividend the company earned 7 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: That may be so; but, if so, the rest went to educational purposes.

Fees and Restriction of Free Places in Non-Elementary Schools.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether representations from local authorities for education against the Board's requirement as to fees and restriction of free places in schools for other than elementary education, provided or aided by a local authority, have been received by the Board; and, if so, in how many cases.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Representations have been received by the Board from various local education authorities, but I am afraid I cannot state the number.

Island of Lewis Line Fisheries.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he will state the quantity of line-caught fish landed in the Island of Lewis by Lewis fishing boats for the years 1901, 1902, 1903, and 1904.

*THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): The estimated quantities of line-caught fish landed on the Island of Lewis were:—In 1901, 63,895 cwts.; in 1902, 42,669 cwts.; in 1903, 36,067 cwts.; in 1904, 64,192 cwts.

Island of Lewis Fishermen and the Mansfield Commission.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether he is aware that at a recent meeting of fishermen at Portnaguran, Island of Lewis, disappointment was expressed that the scope of the inquiry of the Mansfield Commission was not extended to the Island of Lewis, in view of the depletion in the line-fishing industry in that island; and will he state whether the Secretary for Scotland can see his way to receive a deputation from the island consisting of the Secretary to the Lewis and Harris Fishermen's Association, and other representative fishermen, in order that the difficulties under which the fishermen labour may be personally placed before him.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The Answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. The Secretary for Scotland does not consider that it would serve any useful purpose to receive the proposed deputation. For his reasons for arriving at this conclusion I may refer the hon. Member to a letter on this subject addressed to him on February 15th.

Rating of Ecclesiastical Buildings in Scotland.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate if he is aware that churches which may have been occasionally used for temperance meetings, lectures, and objects connected with Christianity have been called upon to pay rates, and that exceptions have been made in certain cases in respect of parish churches; and, if so, whether, in remote districts where no other building is available for such meetings, the old practice will be reverted to.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The matter referred to by the hon. Member is governed by the Statute 37 and 38 Vic. c. 20. An important decision was given by the Court of Session in January, 1901, in a sense adverse to exemption in the particular case before it (The Trustees of United Free Church *v.* Parish Council Edinburgh 3 Fraser 414). The Secretary for Scotland is unable to take any action, the question being one which must be governed by the decision of the Courts. I am not aware of the exceptions referred to. Details as to the exemptions allowed are given in the Local Government Board's circular of 28th October, 1896.

Belfast Licensed Victualler's Valuation Appeal.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that by a recent decision in the Court of Appeal in Ireland, in the case of W. J. Armstrong, Shankhill Road, Belfast, with regard to the valuation of his licensed premises by the Commissioners of Valuation, the principle is laid down that licensed public-houses in Ireland may be valued in regard to their licences; and, if so, whether, seeing that the Irish practice is recognised in the Inland Revenue Act of 1880, which was passed for Excise purposes, and that the effect of the judgment of the Court of Appeal would be that a much heavier burden would be laid on the licensed traders of

Belfast, he will, in view of the disparity of the taxation and the taxable capacity of England and Ireland, introduce legislation to restore the Irish practice in regard to publicans' licences.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I cannot admit the construction put by the hon. Member on the Inland Revenue Act of 1880. The chief benefit of the increase in rating upheld by the judgment of the Court of Appeal will be conferred on the general body of the ratepayers of Belfast. The practice referred to is identical with that prevailing in England. There is no intention to introduce legislation on the subject.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Is it not the fact that the ratepayers of Belfast in the city council protested against this; was not a Select Committee appointed to deal with the matter, and did it not object to the system on which the valuation has been based; and will its recommendations be carried into effect?

MR. ATKINSON'S reply was inaudible.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: The Select Committee in its Report condemned——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot make a statement.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Well, do the Government intend to carry out the recommendations of the Committee?

MR. ATKINSON: I have said there is no intention to introduce legislation.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): Was Ireland not exceptionally treated by the Act of 1880 by allowing 20 per cent. to be added to the valuation in consequence of the lower valuation under the Act of 1852?

MR. ATKINSON: That was not the question discussed in the Court of Appeal.

MR. CLANCY pressed for a more definite Answer, but MR. SPEAKER directed that notice must be given of any further Questions.

The Administration of the Land Act by the Estates Commissioners.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether the Government or the Lord-Lieutenant has issued any regulations, directions, or instructions, in correspondence or otherwise, to the Estates Commissioners causing an alteration in any way of their policy or administration of the Land Act of 1903 in respect to evicted tenants, or the sale of estates, or any other matter connected with their administration of the Act; and, if so, whether these regulations, directions, or instructions will be laid on the Table of the House in accordance with the pledge given by the right hon. Member for Dover on behalf of the Government on July 1st, 1903.

The following Question also appeared on the Paper—

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the confidential communications in relation to the reinstatement of evicted tenants, which have been addressed to the Estates Commissioners by the Irish Government, were of such a character as to control in any way the discretion of the Estates Commissioners in dealing with carrying out the work of reinstatement.

MR. ATKINSON: My right hon. friend the Member for Dover stated on February 20th† that no regulations of the nature contemplated by Section 23, Subsection 8, of the Act of 1903 had yet been made. There has been no change in the position in this respect since that date. Communications have passed between my right hon. friend and the Commissioners, but these are Departmental and of a confidential character. I would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman to postpone the last query till my right hon. friend the new Chief Secretary has had an opportunity of considering the whole matter.

County and District Council—Elections in Ireland.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 609.

Ireland whether county councillors, district councillors, or Poor Law guardians holding uncontested seats may act as presiding officers at the forthcoming election of county and district councillors in Ireland.

MR. ATKINSON: This is an abstract question upon which I must respectfully decline to express an opinion.

Construction of Piers in County Mayo.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he will state the reason for the delay in proceeding with the construction of the proposed new piers at Belmullet, Mallaranny, and Innishlyre, county Mayo; and, if it is still proposed to go on with these works, when a beginning will be made.

MR. ATKINSON: Negotiations are still in progress between the Government and the Midland Great Western Railway Company in reference to the scheme of which the construction of marine works in the county Mayo formed a part. Until these negotiations have been brought to a conclusion I cannot make any further statement in the matter.

Sales to Urban Tenants in Ireland.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether the town of Boyle, situate on the King-Harman Estate, recently sold under the Land Act of 1903, has been included in the general terms of sale to the tenants, both urban and rural, and that these terms have been ratified by the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, will he state what action will be taken in regard to the case of Ballymote, on the Gore Booth Estate, similar in all respects to that of Boyle.

MR. ATKINSON: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the negative. I beg to refer to my reply to the Questions of the hon. Member for North Roscommon on the 7th instant,[†] in which the facts were fully set forth. On the 9th instant,[‡] I informed the hon. Member that the town of Ballymote was expressly excluded from the originating application lodged in the case of the Gore Booth Estate.

Sligo and the Marine Works Act.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, will he explain why Sligo, although a maritime county, has hitherto received no grant under the Marine Works Act, or from any other fund; whether he is aware that the necessity for the opening of marine and other works of public utility has been repeatedly urged on the Government by the county council and other local public bodies; and whether, seeing that distress exists in many portions of the county, the Government will now consent to the giving of a grant towards the drainage of the Owenmore, and the erection of piers in Sligo.

MR. ATKINSON: The money provided by the Marine Works Act was allocated to works, the selection of which was made according to their relative importance. For this reason it was not found practicable to expend any portion of the money in Sligo. But the hon. Member is in error in stating that no grants have been made to the county from other funds. Free grants amounting to £18,814 have been expended in marine works in this county under the 43 Vic. cap. 14 and the 46 & 47 Vic. cap. 26. In addition, the greater part of the free grant of over £88,000 on the Swinford-Collooney Railway was expended in Sligo. There are no funds at the disposal of Government for undertaking the works mentioned at the end of the Question. The Congested Districts Board, however, has undertaken to construct a small pier at Knocklane at a cost of £300, and the county council have agreed to contribute the sum of £100 towards the work.

Case of H. J. Livingstone, of Newry.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask Mr Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can state if H. J. Livingstone, late of Newry, absconded before, or if he absconded after, the issue of the warrant for his arrest.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg also to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can state under what statute the Inspector-General of the

---

[†] See page 583.

[‡] See page 931.

Royal Irish Constabulary was empowered to forbid the execution of the warrant issued by a resident magistrate in public Court, for the arrest of H. J. Livingstone, of Newry; whether he can state the precedents, if any, for such a course; and whether he can state what official or what member of the Government directed the Inspector-General not to execute the warrant.

Mr. ATKINSON: Livingstone had, before the warrant issued, left his usual place of abode in Newry, and it is believed had succeeded in escaping from this kingdom. I have already informed the hon. Member that no direction was given relative to the execution in this country of the warrant against Livingstone. Livingstone had absconded before any direction was asked for, and the direction given had reference solely to the steps necessary to be taken to have him arrested abroad and brought back to this country. The charge made in general terms was one for which the accused person could not be prosecuted under the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96 s. 80, without the sanction of the Attorney-General. Every effort was made to obtain evidence to sustain the charge, and as sufficient evidence was not forthcoming a direction was in the usual course given by the Irish Executive to the Inspector-General not to take any steps, which would necessarily have been futile, to have Livingstone arrested abroad. I decline to give a list of such cases, which are of frequent occurrence, and I also decline to state the names of the officials before whom the matter came, or by whom the directions were given.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Do I understand that the right hon. Gentleman himself directed the Inspector-General with regard to this matter?

Mr. ATKINSON: The hon. Member must understand nothing of the kind.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Did Livingstone abscond before the warrant was issued?

Mr. ATKINSON: He had left the place before the information was sworn on which the warrant was granted.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Then on what authority did the right hon. Gentleman the other day make the misleading statement that he absconded after the warrant was issued. I press for an Answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman has declined to answer.

Mr. MACVEAGH: No, he declined to give me a list of cases.

Mr. ATKINSON; I am not aware that the hon. Member's interpretation of my former Answer is the right one.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Look at *Hansard.*

Mr. ATKINSON: At any rate, I have now more precise information.

Segrave Estate, County Galway.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the position of the tenants on the Segrave Estate, at Kilconnell, county Galway, consisting of forty-seven families living on less than 500 acres of land; whether he is aware that there were 400 acres of grazing land on this estate let to four grazing tenants, and that because the agricultural tenants refused to purchase without having these 400 acres divided amongst them, an arrangement has now been made by the agent to create new tenancies in these farms for the purpose of defeating the chances of these forty-seven tenants to get the 400 acres divided amongst them; and, if so, whether he will call the attention of the Estates Commissioners to this case, with a view to having these holdings inspected before any agreements for sale are sanctioned.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Commissioners have received a memorial from the tenants on this estate relative to the grass lands referred to. No proceedings, however, have yet been instituted before the Commissioners by the owner. In the event of such proceedings they will consider the question of the grass lands.

Alleged Outrage at Woodville.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for

Ireland if he will state if he has any official reports in regard to an alleged outrage at the residence of Mr. Persse, Woodville, county Galway; and, if so, whether he will state their purport.

MR. ATKINSON: The occurrence referred to consists in this, that the fanlight over the door of Mr. Persse's residence was broken, it is believed, by a blow from a stone and not by a shot from a firearm. The matter has received and will continue to receive the close attention of the police, but for the reason given by me on Thursday last† I must decline to disclose the contents of their reports, which are confidential documents.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Then the two columns of sensational journalism had no foundation in fact?

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Good old *Globe*.

Rent Reductions in Clare.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction expressed by representative bodies in county Clare at the reductions of 5 per cent. in West Clare and 10 per cent. in East Clare given by the Sub-Commission at the last hearing of fair-rent applications; will he state what previous knowledge or experience had this gentleman who inspected these lands of Clare farming or the nature of Clare land and the climatic conditions of that county; and whether, in view of these expressions of want of confidence in the Lay Sub-Commissioner, he will represent to the Land Commission the advisability of transferring the services of this gentleman to a part of the country with which he has had some previous aquaintance.

MR. ATKINSON: Representations have been made to the effect mentioned in the first part of the Question. The qualifications of Mr. Esmonde, the Lay Assistant Commissioner referred to, are set forth in Parliamentary Paper, No. 151, of the session of 1902. From his appointment in June, 1899, to March, 1901, Mr. Esmonde was employed in the counties of Monaghan and Fermanagh; from March, 1901, to April, 1902, in the county of Cavan; from April, 1902, to September, 1904, in the counties of Cork and Kerry, and since the latter date in Clare. The Commissioners have every confidence in the ability and impartiality of Mr. Esmonde.

MR. KILBRIDE: Had Mr. Esmonde before his appointment any practical knowledge of county Clare land.

MR. ATKINSON: The Parliamentary Papers give his qualifications.

MR. KILBRIDE: I have seen them. He had no practical knowledge.

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he intends to introduce the Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill during the present session; and, if so, what period of the session it will be brought in.

MR. ATKINSON: I should hope during the course of this week.

Typhoid Fever at Derrygonnelly.

MR. EDWARD MITCHELL (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he will say what steps, if any, the Local Government Board have taken to insist upon the local authority dealing with the insanitary condition of the village of Derrygonnelly, county Fermanagh; if he is aware that at present an outbreak of typhoid fever exists, and that one death at least has taken place therefrom; and if he will state what immediate action the Local Government Board intend to take in the matter.

MR. ATKINSON: It is the fact that five cases of enteric fever have occurred in this village and that one of the patients has died. A complaint has been made to the Local Government Board under the 15th Section of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1896, that the sanitary authority has made default in the performance of its duty. The Board have accordingly directed a local inquiry to be held and the rural district council has been so informed.

---

† See page 933

Horse Disease at Waterford.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if the Government intend compensating owners for the loss sustained by them by the death or the destruction, by the directions of the veterinary authorities, of horses suffering from epizootic lymphangitis, in the Waterford district, owing to the fact that the disease was introduced by artillery horses sent from South Africa to Waterford.

Mr. ATKINSON: The Department, in pursuance of the powers conferred upon them by Section 19 of the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894, propose to make an Order providing for the slaughter of horses in the county Waterford suffering from the disease mentioned, and for the payment of compensation out of the rates to the owner. One-half of the amount of such compensation will, under Section 72 of the Act, be repaid to the local authority from the General Cattle Diseases Fund.

Belturbet Postal Service.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what would be the cost of despatching a post on the 9.5 or 9.45 a.m. train from Belturbet, which connects locally and with the English mail; and also to state the weekly wage paid to the messengers in the district between Belturbet and Milltown for the six-day service.

Lord STANLEY: The cost of a mail service from Belturbet to Cavan by the 9.5 a.m. or 9.45 a.m. train would be about £6 or £8 a year, but the correspondence which would be included in such a despatch would be trifling in amount. The postman who works between Belturbet and Milltown receives wages of 20s. a week. He, however, performs certain duties in the town of Belturbet in addition to the delivery to Milltown.

Belfast Mail Service.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can now say to what extent he proposes to give greater facilities in the mail service between Belfast and London.

Lord STANLEY: I have not yet been able to arrive at a decision on this subject. The negotiations with the various railway companies are proceeding and there shall be no loss of time in dealing with the matter.

Mr. SLOAN: Has the noble Lord any idea when a settlement may be expected?

Lord STANLEY: No, the negotiations are with railway companies, and I have no idea when they will conclude.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Will the noble Lord take into consideration the claims of other parts of Ulster in this matter?

Lord STANLEY: Yes, I am doing so.

Letters Addressed in the Irish Language.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the letter sent by Mr. Thomas Murphy was addressed to Bean ni Ghabhraim, Teac-osda Priomhaideach, Radharc an Chuain, Kilronan, Aran Island, Galway; and can he state what is the error alleged to be found in this address which caused a delay of four days in the delivery of the letter. The hon. Member, on putting the Question, said he regretted the amount of space which the address occupied on the Notice Paper. It was due to the use of ordinary instead of Irish characters.

Lord STANLEY: I have not seen the letter to which the hon. Member refers; but if I had seen it I fear that I should be in no better position for answering him, for I understand that the address, which I do not venture to pronounce, was written in Irish characters and not in the Roman characters which the hon. Member is good enough to use in his printed Question.

Mr. BOLAND: If I supply the actual envelope containing the address, will the right hon. Gentleman have it submitted to a competent Irish authority to decide the question?

Lord STANLEY: No, Sir.

Mr. BOLAND: I will put down another Question.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): Is it a fact that the addressee was unable to read this address?

Lord STANLEY: It is more than likely.

Clerical Duties in the Dublin Post Office.

Mr. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General will be state what system is adopted when selecting men for clerical duties in the Post Office, Dublin; is he aware that some of those employed upon writing duties in the Controller's Office and in the sorting office have but a few years service, and took comparatively low places in the entrance examinations; can he state what special qualifications these men possess; and, seeing that clerical work is a necessary qualification for promotion, and that men have been debarred from promotion because they did not qualify in clerical duties which they were not allowed to perform, will he see that every officer is afforded an opportunity of performing writing duties.

Lord STANLEY: The officers are selected on the reports of their superior officers as to their intelligence, zeal, and general good conduct, and not with regard to the place they obtained in their entrance examination. Two or three of the officers employed on writing duties are comparatively junior and they are employed on duties of a routine and minor character. All that is possible is done to give officers who are in any way fit for promotion opportunities of qualifying, but it would not be possible to test all the officers in the sorting office on writing duties. Experience in such duties is not an essential qualification for promotion.

Irish National Teachers' Pension Fund.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of his refusal to appoint a Select Committee to enquire into the present condition of the Irish National Teachers' Pension Fund and of the discontent of the teachers in connection with this matter, he will allow an actuary nominated by the teachers to be present at, and take part in, the quinquennial investigation to be held this year; and can he say when the investigation will be held.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by employing more than one actuary, but care will be taken to select an actuary of independent position and high attainments.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH: But will the Government allow an actuary to be nominated by the teachers?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I do not think it necessary.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH: Will you consider the point?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I do not think it would lead to any satisfactory result.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is not the present condition of the fund entirely due to Treasury neglect?

[No Answer was returned.]

Report of the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, under Section 23, Sub-section 14, of the Irish Land Act, 1903, instructions have been given to the Estates Commissioners under that Act to make one of the periodical Reports authorised by the section; and, if so, when these instructions were given; and if the form of the Report was prescribed.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: Yes, Sir; the form of the Report has been prescribed by the Treasury and was communicated to the Irish Government on February 28th, 1905.

Use of Dredger for Galway Harbour.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can now say when the Board of Works' dredger will be available for loan or hire to the Galway Harbour Commissioners.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I have nothing to add to the Answer I gave to the hon. Member on March 9th.* It is not yet possible to say when the dredger will be available.

Galway Docks—Lighting and Dredging.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the nature of the assurances and promises made to the deputation which some months ago waited upon the Board of Works to make representations on the subject of the lighting of the docks at Galway and the need for the loan of a dredger.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: No promises nor assurances of any kind were given. The deputation was informed that the dredger was bespoken for the summer of 1905.

Private Members' Bills.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will grant facilities for the early consideration of the Trawlers Certificates Suspension Bill.

The following Questions were put at the same time—

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he is prepared to give facilities for a Bill to extend the Crofters Act, 1886, to Buteshire.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the feeling aroused by the operation of foreign trawlers in areas on the coast of Scotland in which trawling is prohibited, he will afford facilities for the discussion of the Foreign Trawlers Regulation Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In the present state of business it is not possible to undertake to give special facilities for either of the measures referred to in these Questions.

MR. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the other day the Lord-Advocate held out hopes that a Trawling Bill would be dealt with?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not, but if it be the fact it does not alter the condition of public business.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): On behalf of my right hon. friend the Member for Stirling Burghs, I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in order to explain the relations between Sir Antony MacDonnell and His Majesty's Ministers, he will lay upon the Table further Papers bearing on the matter; and, in particular, any statement submitted by Sir Antony MacDonnell to his official superiors, either before or after his censure by the Cabinet.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I have also to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, on the appointment of a new Chief Secretary, the position of Sir Antony MacDonnell and the conditions of his office will be the same as those set out in the correspondence disclosed to the House by the late Chief Secretary on Wednesday, February 22nd, last.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to lay no Papers on the Table. As regards the second Question, the tenure of the present Under-Secretary for Ireland, as that of all his predecessors, and as that of all his successors, will be that of an ordinary Civil servant.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Has the right hon. Gentleman any objection to state whether, when the Cabinet censured Sir Antony MacDonnell, each member was aware of the correspondence which had passed between the Chief Secretary and Sir Antony MacDonnell?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I decline to answer any Question of that character; but I can assure the hon. Gentleman that to the best of my belief the really relevant facts of this case were fully before the Cabinet.

---

* See page 937.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: Are we to understand that the position of Sir Antony MacDonnell is not what it was when the right hon. Member for Dover offered, and the Prime Minister sanctioned, the appointment, and that he now serves on new terms? What are these terms?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have always told the House, what I believe is the fact, that the terms of the appointment have always been those of an ordinary Civil servant.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: The late Chief Secretary expressed the opinion that they were extra and extraordinary terms connected with the appointment of Sir Antony MacDonnell. I should like to know whether these extraordinary and unusual terms are now abrogated, and, if so, whether Sir Antony MacDonnell accepts that abrogation?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not accept that interpretation of my right hon. friend's statement. It is perfectly true that in the letters read to the House there was a mention, for instance, of the maintenance of law and order and the passing of a Land Bill. ["University education and co-ordination."] Yes, there were two or three questions, I am not quite sure what they were; and it is also true that it has not been usual, no doubt, for an Under-Secretary appointed in the ordinary way to discuss before his appointment questions affecting policy. Nevertheless, when an Under-Secretary is brought in from the outside, like Sir Redvers Buller or Sir Robert Hamilton, there may properly be discussion between the Under-Secretary and the Chief Secretary upon matters of policy. That, however, does not affect the fact that the Under-Secretary accepts and holds office on the ordinary tenure of an ordinary Civil servant.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Did not the right hon. Member for Dover state that it would be impossible to expect a man of Sir Antony MacDonnell's position to take office on the ordinary terms of a Civil servant; and did he not state specifically that he accepted him as a colleague.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have just explained to the hon. Gentleman in what respect there was a difference. It was not a difference which affected his tenure as a Civil servant. It was a difference which is to be found in the case of every distinguished Civil servant brought in from the outside to fill an office in a branch of the service of which he has not been a member before. It is not my business to interpret other people's language, but if a Secretary of State refers to an Under-Secretary as his colleague that does not imply that they are on an equality.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Would the right hon. Gentleman clear this matter up by answering this Question: Has there been any change in the position of Sir Antony MacDonnell owing to recent events?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know what the hon. Gentleman means by change. He holds under the tenure I have described. Of course there has been a change. The Land Act, for instance, has been passed.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I am sorry to press this matter, but I should like to ask whether, in the letter which has been quoted from Sir Antony MacDonnell, the phrase was used that mere secretarial criticism would be altogether below what his position required. Has any change been made in the conditions on which he holds office in that respect?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It is true that Sir Antony MacDonnell most naturally stated that mere secretarial criticism was not work he cared to undertake, having, as he had, the choice of joining the Indian Council. Nor is it the work commonly given to distinguished Under-Secretaries. They are not, as a rule, except through some disagreement with their chief, confined, and they ought not to be confined, merely to secretarial work.

Mr. SLOAN: Does the Under-Secretary still hold the same right to represent the Irish Executive on special missions to the North on the question of higher education?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: He has no right except the rights he derives from his chief.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Is there any foundation for the report that the Government have decided that the Under-Secretary shall be dismissed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

The Colonial Conference and the Fiscal Question.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of the Colonial Conference which meets in 1906 taking place before a general election, the question of Imperial unity on the basis of preferential duties on colonial produce will be submitted to that Conference.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is probably aware that we have over and over again stated that in the course of this Parliament we propose to take no steps with regard to fiscal reform.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the British representatives at the Colonial Conference to be held in 1906 will have power, subject to the subsequent approval of this House, to negotiate a scheme of preferential trading with the Colonies on the basis of the taxation of food and raw material.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I answered that Question when I replied to the hon. Member for Kincardineshire.

MR. SOARES: Do I understand they will not have the power?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We are not dealing with that question.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I should like to clear this matter up. The right hon. Gentleman's statement has been that he will make no proposal in Parliament, but the question now asked refers to action taken outside of Parliament—in the Colonial Conference.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have over and over again said that in the course of the present Parliament we do not propose to deal with the fiscal problem.

MR. CROMBIE: Will the instructions to the Conference be given by Parliament or the Government?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman had better wait till the date of the meeting of the Conference is rather nearer.

High Fees and Restriction of Free Places in Non-Elementary Schools.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that among local authorities and persons concerned with public education, dissatisfaction is felt with certain regulations of the Board of Education which prescribe high fees and restrict free places at schools which provide education other than elementary; and whether he will appoint an early day for the discussion of the Education Votes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that this subject is being considered by the Board of Education, and that the views of that Board are set out in a letter to the Association of Education Committees published so recently as March 2nd. The general effect is that the Board do not intend to apply a hard and fast rule, but all cases will be considered with regard to local conditions and their requirements modified accordingly. I cannot fix any special date for the Education Vote, but probably an opportunity will be found on the Vote on Account.

Navy Estimates.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the important issues raised in connection with the Navy by Part II. of the Return granted to the hon. Member for Dundee, he can see his way to postpone further discussion of the Estimates until this portion is issued.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Every effort has been made to supply this information, and I would like to point out that the fact that the Return is not ready does not throw any obstacle in the way of the proper discussion of the Navy Votes, as later on the House will have an opportunity of dealing with details.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Not on the elimination policy. How can we discuss that?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman will put down that Question I will consider it in consultation with the representatives of the Admiralty in this House.

STARRED QUESTIONS UNANSWERED.

It being now five minutes to three o'clock thirty-six starred Questions to various Ministers remained unanswered.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BRYCE: Can the right hon. Gentleman give fuller information as to the business of this week, and can he say when the Army Estimates will be in our hands?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope the Army Estimates will be in the hands of Members to-night. I propose to take Supplementary Estimates to-morrow, and probably also on Wednesday.

STORE ACCOUNTS.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to a notice of Motion standing in the name of the hon. Member for the St. George's Division of the Tower Hamlets in reference to the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General on the wastage of supplies in South Africa and elsewhere, and to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will grant early facilities for the discussion of the Report and Motion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As I have regretfully had to say more than once, in the present state of public business it is impossible for me to grant the facilities asked for.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: May I ask if a day can be given for the consideration of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I would be quite ready to allocate one of the Supply days if that would meet the view of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law in relation to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children." [Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [Lords.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SOARES, Member for the Barnstaple Division of Devonshire, rose in his place and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "The appointment to the important office of President of the Board of Trade of a person not being a Member of this House;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen—

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until the Evening Sitting, this day.

NEW BILLS.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

"To amend the Agricultural Holdings Acts, and to make other provisions as to the tenure of agricultural land," presented by Mr. Channing; supported by Mr. Price, Mr. Harold Reckitt, Mr. Brynmor Jones, and Mr. Lambert; to be read a second time upon Friday, May 5th, and to be printed. [Bill 96.]

TOWN HOLDINGS BILL.

"To give compensation to occupying Tenants of Town Holdings for beneficial improvements," presented by Mr. Channing; supported by Sir Walter Foster, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Kearley, and Sir James Woodhouse; to be read a second time upon Friday, May 5th, and to be printed. [Bill 97.]

SUPPLY [1st Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 129,000 officers, seamen, and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on March 31st, 1906, including 20,211 Royal Marines."

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said they were entitled on that Vote to discuss the whole naval policy for the current year. That policy was one of unusual importance, and after the Answer given him by the First Lord of the Treasury that afternoon he need not offer any excuse for calling attention to the entirely unsatisfactory conditions under which they were invited to approach the debate. In the forefront of these Estimates stood a new proposal with reference to the distribution and mobilisation of the Fleet, and in the forefront of that in turn was to be found a sweeping proposal to throw out of the Navy List, as the Prime Minister had stated, some 130 vessels. These were to be abolished or removed. As soon as he found that to be the intention of the Government he put down early in the session a Motion for two Returns. In the first he asked for a list of the vessels to be struck out, showing their names, date of building, cost of repairs, and the cost of the last substantial repairs; and in the second he asked to be supplied with the number of cruisers which had not been struck off. He admitted that the second Return had been fully given, but he did wish to point out that there were sixteen vessels the names of which appeared on both lists. He had honestly tried to work out the information from the material given them, but he had been unsuccessful; and there was ample justification for their insisting on further information before the debate was proceeded with. For instance, he found in the list of vessels struck off the "Pallas," completed in 1891, of 7,500 h.p., 19·1 knots, cost £151,000; yet in the Estimates for this year there was a proposal to spend a sum of nearly £8,000 on her for repairs. On another vessel of the same class, built in 1892, and costing £160,000, it was proposed to spend this year £8,450. Then in regard to two other vessels, the "Medea" and the "Medusa," both of which originally cost £164,000, having been completed in the year 1889, only two years ago the sums of £75,000 and £70,000 were spent respectively on them, and yet these vessels were to be relegated to the llama class, from which nothing more was to be expected. He was not now challenging the policy of the Government, but he was submitting that the Committee could not proceed to consider these Votes, and to pronounce any judgment upon them unless it had before it all the information relating to these ships. He therefore proposed to move formally, so as to give the Secretary to the Admiralty an opportunity to explain, to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)

*The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said he thought the hon. Gentleman had taken a line of argument which rather defeated his own object. He had stated certain specific facts in regard to ships, and he had indicated that those ships were on the Navy Estimates for the present year, and, therefore, it was quite evident that in regard to those particular matters and the expenditure on these individual ships there would be ample opportunity of discussion.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I was not referring to this year, I was referring to the year just completed.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said he had certainly understood the hon. Gentleman to refer to repairs to be carried out in the coming year, but he would like to point out to him that the whole policy of the Government could be discussed on Vote 12. He would further put it to him on higher ground, and he would submit to the Committee that the question of expenditure in past years on individual ships really did not affect the main question of the policy which the Committee had under discussion. His view was that this was a great question of policy—a policy of which there were three parts, the redistribution of the Fleet, the nucleus of the crews, and the laying-up of particular ships. The Committee had information on all these points. It had been given the actual names of the ships which were to be laid up, and the only point which remained open and on which the House had not information was the actual amount of money which had been spent in past years on these particular vessels. But on that, surely, did not depend the question whether the policy they were pursuing was right or wrong, and even if hon. Members opposite were able to prove entirely to their own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the Committee that more money had been spent upon these ships in past years than was necessary, he did not think it would alter their policy, or could convince them that it was an undesirable one. Each one of the three branches of the policy to which he had referred was interdependent, and he asserted that it was impossible to carry out their plans unless the three parts were carried out together. Therefore, the whole thing narrowed itself down to this, could the hon. Member succeed in proving that the Admiralty in past years had not sufficiently anticipated the policy which was now being adopted, could he prove that money had been wasted ? That surely was the whole object in view. [Cries of "No, only one object."] That, at any rate to his mind, was the issue, and he submitted that in order to prove that they would have to show that the expenditure was unnecessary, not merely under the circumstances which existed at the time the money was spent, but also under the circumstances as they existed to-day. He maintained that the question of expenditure upon particular vessels, even if the figures asked for in the Return were forthcoming, would not affect the opinion of the Committee or of the hon. Member upon the general question of the policy now proposed.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: A full examination of the complete Returns would affect and determine my opinion.

*MR. PRETYMAN: Then we are to take it that the question whether more or less money was spent upon a particular ship will affect the opinion of the hon. Gentleman as to the present policy of the Government ?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I am asking for full particulars.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he was afraid that some hon. Members always attached more value to the lost sheep than to the ninety-nine that remained in the fold, and, therefore, they seemed to attach more importance to information which it had been found impossible to give than to that which had been given. He submitted that the information before the Committee, which gave them the names of all the ships, was sufficient to meet the case, especially as details of their original cost were easily available. He would like to explain that a large proportion of the ships now struck off had not for a long time been in the fighting line. Many of them had been withdrawn for some time, and had not been regarded as fighting ships, so that the number actually withdrawn from the fighting line was not so large as had been stated. Taking all the facts into consideration, he did not think that the hon. Gentleman had made out a case why the House could not perfectly well continue the discussion on the general question of the policy of the Admiralty.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he was a strong advocate of the new policy of getting rid of obsolete ships, but he thought there was something in the contention of hon. Gentlemen opposite that they had not got the information they had asked for. He thought much of it could have been obtained by the Secretary of the Admiralty. For instance, the hon. Gentleman had omitted to give a Return of the complement of men to each of the ships to be laid up.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he was not asked for that.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Oh, yes.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said the Return asked for the cost of the ships and the complement of men, and there could have been no possible difficulty in giving those particulars. He, therefore, thought the hon. Member for Dundee had some cause for complaint. But he was personally a strong advocate on general grounds of this new policy of getting rid of useless ships, and it would be convenient, if possible, to do without the information which had been asked for and to discuss the policy on its merits. He, therefore, hoped that the Motion would not be pressed to a division. Let hon. Members come forward manfully and tackle the new policy, and show, if they could, that it was a bad policy. His own conviction was that it was an extremely good policy, and he rejoiced that so strong a man as Sir John Fisher had been found able to impose it on Lord Selborne. His only regret was that the policy was not adopted years ago.

*Lord GEORGE HAMILTON (Middlesex, Ealing) said he was entirely in favour of the policy of getting rid of obsolete and useless ships, and if they were all agreed upon that it really did not seem that there was any necessity whatever for postponing the discussion. If the hon. Gentleman who moved to report Progress would look at the Return he would see that page 1 was entirely occupied with the names of vessels which it was not intended to sell, and in the first category of which were included the "Medea" and the "Medusa." Their armaments were not to be taken out of them, they were to be retained, and, therefore, if money had been spent upon them in past years they would be all the more efficient in case of emergency. The only point which seemed to be doubtful was in regard to the ships that were to be sold and those which were not for sale, and he would suggest that on that subject further information might be given, and that the Prime Minister should give an undertaking that no ship should be sold until hon. Members had had an opportunity of expressing their opinions as to the advisability of getting rid of individual ships. That would be, in his opinion, a more business-like proceeding, and if, as he believed, the majority of the House were in favour of the general policy of the Admiralty—the policy of getting rid of old and obsolete vessels—surely it would be well for them to proceed to take the discussion on that policy and leave details for a future occasion.

*Sir JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) agreed that they ought not to report Progress because they had insufficient information. It appeared to him that this question of removal of ships might well be dealt with on the Construction Vote. He was entirely in accord with the policy of removing ineffective, inefficient, and obsolete vessels. It was no doubt an important matter that the House should be given reasons why certain ships were retained and why others were to be sold, but he could not see anything whatever to hinder a full discussion on the Naval Estimates on these points, and therefore he did not think they would be justified in postponing the whole consideration of the general naval policy of the Government.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 160; Noes, 181. (Division List No. 42.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway

Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(S. Andrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, DavidBrynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfred (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt.Hon.John(Montrose
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely,Maj.J. E B.(Isle of Wight
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills,ArthurWalters (N.Dorset
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse,Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster Rt.Hn.HughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r
Balfour Rt Hn GeraldW.(Leeds
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach,RtHn.Sir Michael Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Campbell,Rt Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell,J H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Chamberlain,Rt Hn J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon.Sir John C.R.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Dyke,Rt.Hon Sir WilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn.Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay,Sir R.B (Invern'ssB'ghs)
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald Sir Robert Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon Maj Evans-(Tr'H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirE W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nderry
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Heath,SirJames(Staffords.N W
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus

Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson,Hn H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lawson,John Grant(Yorks.N.R
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W(Evesham
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Maxwell, Rt Hn SirH E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.JH (Dumfriesshire
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, David J(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel,Hn. Wm. RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir HarryS(Limehouse
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austen (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond,Rt Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-Col. A.C.E.(Taunton)
Welby,Sir Charles G E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, A Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that the Committee having decided by a majority of twenty-one that they must proceed with the discussion of the Estimates on the meagre material before them, he would proceed to speak on the point with which they were more immediately concerned in this Vote. He was tempted to go back to the debate of Monday last, but he would not follow his instinct. He thought it was useless now to pursue the controversy about the size of the Navy. His belief was that the international competition which resulted in large navies could only be ended by international negotiation on the line suggested by his hon. friend behind him. One consoling feature of the present situation was the determined attitude of that growing naval Power, the United States, to put an end to the rule by which private property at sea could be captured by belligerents. That, he thought, caused the danger to commerce which had demanded and tolerated large naval expenditure. The hon. Gentleman opposite had, following the example which was set in this House a year ago, attributed to one official much of the extravagant administration which had taken place. That was a dangerous course to take. He associated himself with what was said on the other side of the House the other day, that in the Navy administration continuity of policy was essential. To single out one official for special praise or special responsibility was a gross injustice to previous Boards of Admiralty. It was unfair to existing naval officers in or out of the Admiralty, and he ventured to say that it was specially unfair to the officers themselves who were singled out for praise or invidious distinction. In recent times he deplored the too frequent appearance of the Admiralty Department in the province of advertising. The Admiralty had never been an advertising Department, and the less they heard of it in advertising circles the better.

That led him to the few words he wanted to say about the new distribution of officers, and the new *role* that was to be played by the First Sea Lord. The Committee had now full information on that point, and he did not think the change amounted to so much as some newspapers would have them believe. He read in one paper the other day that they had constituted a Commander-in-Chief for the Navy, the sort of thing which the noble Lord the Member for Ealing on the occasion of the debate ten years ago denounced on the ground that we must not have a naval autocrat to rule. He did not know that it had come to that, but the sting of the new system was contained in the tail of the Memorandum, which assigned to the First Sea Lord the position that all the other Lords and all other persons were to communicate with him on everything of importance. That was a large extension, and if it meant more than that which the Admiralty system allowed ten years ago he should withhold his assent to it. On that occasion ten years ago he was authorised on behalf of the Admiralty to state that the position of the First Sea Lord was that of a *primus inter pares*—the first among equals—without special responsibility for the disposition of the Fleet. If anyone shared his doubts as to the new system he would point out that whatever disposition might be made by Lord Selborne or his successor, the part assigned to the First Sea Lord was personal to the present holder and might be altered. That was all he would say about the distribution of the business.

He now came to the scheme of distribution and mobilisation of the Fleet. He was sorry that the First Lord of the Treasury had left the bench, because that right hon. Gentleman was responsible, by the statement he had made, for a great deal of what might be called the misunderstanding. He hoped that the representative of the Admiralty would be able to defend the right hon. Gentleman's words. He wished to deal with two points of the new scheme; one relating to the distribution of the Fleet, and the other to the elimination of ships from the active list. By distribution he meant the location of the ships, the settlement and composition of the squadrons, and the determination of the number and classes of ships which constituted these squadrons. All of that he had always held to be the special and particular business of the Admiralty acting on its own responsibility. Four years ago this question was discussed in the House in connection with what was called the Mediterranean scare. A most deplorable agitation arose, fomented by letters circulated in the House, stated as having been received from distinguished naval officers actually in high command. The Admiralty of that day did not show the courage which they ought to have done, and condemn the scare. He was content to abide by what Lord Selborne said in another place on this subject of the distribution of the Mediterranean Fleet. He said that if Parliament or the Press intended to take out of the hands of the Admiralty the distribution of the British Fleet, he for one should cease to be personally responsible. It would be for the Admiralty acting on its knowledge, on the knowledge of the Foreign Office, and on the responsibility of the Government, and for no one else to settle the distribution of the Fleet. That was good enough for him, and he was surprised that anything more should have been said about it by the Admiralty on this occasion. What had happened? The new scheme of distribution had been announced with much parade, but with very little information. Any one who took up the two documents—the Memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty issued in December last, and the Statement explanatory of the Estimates, would find a pseudo-scientific system which they had chosen to adopt. They rang the changes on devolution and decentralisation; they bandied names about; changed the name of one Fleet, and gave high-sounding titles to certain Admirals. It was very much a question of names, and he defied any one who read the two State Papers to say what had actually taken place. For instance, he found in the Memorandum of December a reference to the China squadron and its proposed distribution, but in the Statement, so far as it contained any reference to the China squadron, it was to the effect that there was no change at all. As to this new scheme of distribution, what was wanted—if they wanted anything at all—was a sort of diagram showing the stations, the ships, and the strength of the squadrons last year and this. Such a diagram ought to be easily made, and he hoped the Admiralty would prepare one and lay it before the Committee before the discussion went much further.

The new distribution was said to be founded on strategical principles; but he did not find the strategy explained at all. On his theory the question of strategy was for the Admiralty, and the less they said about it the better; it would have been better if they had said less than they had done. He did not like the references in the papers to foreign navies. In so far as they were not truisms, they were not necessary and certainly not tactful. Did any one think there was any good in telling Germany that she could keep her navy at home, or in telling Russia that her fleet was decreasing, or in telling the Committee that the navy of the United States would soon reach a limit that would only be bounded by the willingness of the American people to pay for it. These things, he thought, need hardly have been said, but having been said, the Committee should have had a little further information. The hon. Gentleman the Civil Lord of the Admiralty had been much criticised for a statement he had made during the recess. He was not going to quarrel with the words in the first report of the hon. Gentleman's speech. By some unfortunate accident the words which got into the condensed report were not those which the hon. Gentleman actually used; but in the authorised version which appeared in *The Times* the hon. Gentleman summed up as the views of the Admiralty that the British Fleet was now prepared, strategically, for every conceivable emergency, and we must assume that all foreign naval Powers were possible enemies. If that was so, we were in a very happy position, although he failed to grasp the kindly disposition shown in the remark that we should be able to meet all conceivable emergencies.

Finally, on the scheme as a whole, he wished to call the attention of the Committee to what, as he had said already, added to the confusion in the public mind as to the consequences on the public finances of the Memorandum issued by the First Lord of the Admiralty in December last and the Statement now submitted to the Committee. It was alleged that the new scheme of distribution, including the scheme of eliminating certain ships from the active list, would lead and had led to great financial economy. Undoubtedly that was the belief of the Press and the popular belief; but he held it was a popular delusion that the £3,500,000 by which the naval expenditure was reduced was attributable in any appreciable degree to the new scheme of distribution. The saving of £3,510,000 took place almost entirely on Votes 8 and 9. The amount of money to be spent on ships in course of construction or about to be built was cut down by £2,200,000; on armaments £660,000, on repairs £540,000, and on sea stores, £110,000, or a total of £3,510,000, almost exactly the amount of the net saving. What part of this was attributable to the new scheme of distribution? Certainly not new construction or armaments. His belief was, from what he knew of the present state of affairs in the dockyards, that the reduction of armaments was not a permanent or real reduction; and that instead of being reduced it would go up in future years. The saving on sea stores was 12 per cent. and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would explain how the reduction came about, and whether any portion of it was attributable to elimination. Repairs had gone down £540,000. Was any portion of that attributable to the new scheme? His belief was that very little of it would be. He would remind the Committee that in the First Lord's Memorandum it was stated that all the great repairs undertaken in the last five years had been completed, and that the Fleet was now in a more complete state of repair than it had been for many years. If so, that would account for the reduction in the Repairs Vote.

Passing to the subject of elimination of the ships from the Active List, it was said that we were now in a condition to deal intelligently with that part of the scheme. The proposal was that certain ships were to be sold and others laid up; but the Committee were not told what the value of the ships involved was, what the ages of the ships were, or what the opinion of the Admiralty on this part of the case was last year. On two of the ships which were to be laid up—the "Medea" and "Medusa"—the Government had spent on maintenance or repairs within the past two years sums equal to 50 per cent. of the original value of the ships. The First Lord of the Treasury stated at Glasgow that the Government had abolished 130 vessels; but that the Navy had not been weakened in the process. On that occasion, there was a voice, "Good riddance of bad rubbish," and the right hon. Gentleman remarked that that observation put the position more correctly, more concisely, and more pithily than he could. The right hon. Gentleman added that the ships would not only be useless but worse than useless if in time of war they did not possess fighting power and speed; and that with one courageous stroke of the pen, as it were, they had been struck off and the cost of their maintenance and repair removed from the Navy Estimates. The right hon. Gentleman also declared that the strength of the Navy had been increased three-fold; but of that the Committee had not been given any particulars. He would ask the hon. Gentleman whether he adopted the language of the First Lord of the Treasury at Glasgow. Was it a correct statement of the policy of the Admiralty to say that 130 vessels had been abolished? He did not think it was consistent with what the hon. Gentleman himself had stated. He confessed he had some difficulty in realising what the policy of the Admiralty was. The hon. Gentleman stated that the key-note of the scheme was that current expenditure should only be incurred on ships which could be instantaneously ready for war; and he added that no fewer than eighty-four ships had been placed on the scrap heap.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that the number he mentioned extended over three years.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that there was a discrepancy between the two statements of the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Gentleman stated that there would be no more expenditure on what he called the llama class; which, however, would be extremely useful for subsidary purposes in war; and that in the course of three months they could be fitted up for active service. In his opinion, however, that would not be possible. Did this policy mean that these ships were to be in the hands of caretakers, and that no attention was to be paid to their maintenance and repair? That would be a dangerous policy. Deterioration would be certain to occur. Therefore, the Committee should be given a further explanation. He himself did not believe that it would be possible to fit out these ships in three months after they had been lying idle for perhaps two or three years. A fallacy which ran through all the Admiralty statements on the subject was that they compared the minor vessels with the best vessels. Here were a few facts. Germany in recent years had established a class of cruiser of the "Pearl" type. They were built possibly in answer to, certainly in imitation of, the "Pearl" class. That class was now condemned to the scrap heap under the new policy. The United States were also building a class in answer to the "Apollo" class, which was now condemned to the llama class. Then the "Warspite" was to be sent to the scrap heap, although the type was regarded as of some consequence in the Russian navy. He was not condemning the policy of sending these ships to the scrap heap; but the Committee ought to be informed how much money had been expended on them. No less than four first-class cruisers had been condemned; and it was incumbent on the hon. Gentleman to show how he reconciled the present policy with the policy which had prevailed during the last few years of repairing these ships at great expense, when, as a matter of fact, they should have been condemned to the scrap heap.

As regarded new construction, he desired to direct the hon. Gentleman's attention to a discrepancy. On page 91 the figure was given as £9,566,000, and on page 184 at £9,451,000.

* Mr. PRETYMAN said there was a satisfactory explanation of that.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that there must be a mistake somewhere. The two figures could not be correct. The analysis of new construction showed that dockyard-built boats had gone up by £648,000 and contract-built ships had gone down £2,700,000. Eliminating small vessels the total gave a net reduction of £2,200,000 on the Vote for building new ships this year. His first observation upon that was, that this was not the great reduction that it appeared to be. The Committee had to remember what happened in the previous year with regard to the Chilian ships. It was idle now to go on with the pretence kept up by both sides of the House with regard to the purchase of the Chilian ships and to speak of the purchase of those ships, a purchase made in breach of the law, although it was set right afterwards by a Supplementary Estimate, as anything but a special transaction. He struck off, therefore, £960,000 as the amount paid last year as the second instalment of the price of those two Chilian ships, so that the real reduction in new construction this year was only £1,250,000. The First Lord in his Memorandum had made a statement to the effect that new construction should, the bulk of it at all events, be given out to contract, and that less should be taken by the dockyards, which should be devoted mainly to repairs. He did not find that reflected in the First Lord's figures, because he found the Vote for wages of the *personnel* for building new ships in the dockyards reduced by 5 per cent., whilst the reduction in the corresponding item in the contract yards was not less than 25 per cent. That seemed to be somewhat contradictory to the First Lord's Statement that the main work should be given to the contract yards.

There was one thing to which he should like to call attention, and that was the depreciation table, which, if it meant anything at all, meant that our present efficient fighting Fleet could be replaced by an expenditure at the rate of £5,000,000 a year. Therefore if our present Fleet was adequate to the needs of the nation, instead of our paying £9,500,000 as we were going to do this year, we ought to be spending only £5,000,000.

With regard to new construction there were several gaps in the Estimate. The Committee was asked to vote £1,330,000 for ships not yet laid down, which were to be begun in the coming year. When they were asked to vote large sums like that, the better plan would surely be to have an estimate of the total expenditure on that construction. They got the total amount for the next twelve months, but they ought at this stage to have, not the estimate for twelve months, but for the whole expenditure. There was another item not for ships not laid down, but for submarines. There were on the Estimates twenty-four submarines in course of construction, and there was not a single particular or detail given in the Estimates. No doubt there were some details which could not be given, but none of the details which were given with regard to other ships, such as dimensions, etc., were given with regard to submarines. Was there any reason why these particulars, which were known to the Board of Admiralty, and which must be made known to the country by and by, should not be put upon the Estimates now. They ought to be able to fill in the gaps in the Estimates with regard to these submarines, and the Committee ought to be given all the details which might properly be given. They did not know the average cost! He put a Question to the hon. Gentleman recently as to what was the average price of the submarine, and the hon. Gentleman replied about £50,000. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would be able to give some further details with regard to this. He complained also that there was not more information with regard to the "Scouts," of which there were eight. They were in course of construction and had been for some time. They were introduced under conditions of some alarm, and he would invite the hon. Gentleman to say now when the orders for the "Scouts" were placed—the first one had not been delivered yet—as he wanted to know the amount of progress made. The history of the "Scouts" was not consistent with the promise of acceleration which had been made with regard to them. Acceleration was a very important thing, but he doubted whether the hon. Gentleman would get up and say that the Admiralty Board of to-day could do any better than the Board of ten years ago did in the case of the "Majestic" and "Magnificent." That was a record of acceleration then, and it was the record now

His complaint in the main was that in this matter the Committee had not before it the sort of information which was necessary to enable it to carry on a discussion of this kind: that there had been unnecessary concealment of material facts.

A great point had been made of the institution of the Designs Committee. A whole page of the First Lord's Memorandum was given to the constitution of it! He, however, did not intend to say anything about its constitution except that it was too largely official and too little independent in its character; that it was composed too largely of persons to whom the Admiralty had easy access. He thought the proper tribunal would have been one of greater independence—a tribunal of outsiders so to speak—before which the present Committee ought to come as expert witnesses. What he complained of most was the determined secrecy under which their proceedings were carried out. Why should not the Committee know something about the reference to this Committee, and something of its Report. Did the hon. Member justify his not giving the information by precedent?

*Mr. PRETYMAN: No.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said then if he did not, he would ask the hon. Gentleman how he justified his departure from precedents. The Committee was aware that there had been previous Committees of this kind. There was one in 1871, and before the Naval Defence Act programme was completed a Committee of Naval Designs was called in to assist the noble Lords. He submitted that those were precedents which should not be disturbed, but which ought to be followed in a matter which was of public interest. He did not know whether his hon. friend behind him would agree with him, but he believed there was also a Dockyard Committee and his remarks would also apply to that. He saw no reason why the reference to that Committee should be suppressed and its Report concealed.

He absolutely repudiated the suggestion that the Opposition were as responsible as the Government for these large Navy Estimates. The responsibility rested solely upon the Government of the day. Year after year Estimates of naval expenditure had been laid on the Table without a word of explanation or defence. He had never admitted the expenditure of last year or the year before to be justifiable upon any recognised standard of naval power, nor had that expenditure ever been adequately defended or explained. He took up the same position with regard to the present Estimates. The Opposition took no more responsibility for them and no more admitted their necessity than in former years; the responsibility for them rested entirely upon the Government who proposed them, and at the same time refused to give the full information for which the Opposition were entitled to ask.

*Mr. PRETYMAN thought it desirable that he should reply to the hon. Member at once, especially as there were a number of Questions asked while Mr. Speaker was in the Chair to which he had not yet had an opportunity to reply. As to the general criticisms of the hon. Member for Dundee, he did not at all complain of the tone of his remarks with regard to the Board of Admiralty. The Committee would doubtless agree with the hon. Member's deprecation of any discussion which would tend to differentiate between the individual personal responsibility of the various members of the Board of Admiralty. No principle could be of greater value to the Navy than that of the collective responsibility of the Board of Admiralty. As long as they had the collective responsibility of four of the best officers in the Navy, it was clear that the best brain of the four, whether it belonged to the first, second, third, or fourth Lord, would impress itself upon the whole body. That was the real advantage of the Board—that, while there was no individual responsibility outside, the Navy got the full value of the individual knowledge and brain inside.

He hardly followed the criticism of the hon. Member for Dundee with regard to the distribution of the Fleet. The responsibility for the distribution of the Fleet must, doubtless, rest with the Admiralty, and he agreed that the local issues as between one station and another could not profitably be discussed in the House. But the question had to be looked at as a whole. The last thing the Board of Admiralty themselves would think of doing was to discuss such a question in compartments. They could not take this or that particular sea, this port or that base, and discuss it by itself. The question must be discussed with reference to the whole available force of the Fleet. The essence of naval force was extreme mobility, and that consideration alone made it impossible to discuss in the present debate the particular issues of the distribution of the Fleet.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said his point was that as the Admiralty had chosen to lay this matter before the country, the Committee might as well know what the changes really were.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that while the particular considerations which influenced the Admiralty could not profitably be discussed in the House, it was most right and proper that the results should be placed before the country. It was necessary to lay before the House and the country the general effect of the new policy in the distribution of the Fleet, and the hon. Member would have been the first to complain if the change had been carried out and nothing said to the House about it.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) asked whether it was not intended to give in outline the principles which had guided the Admiralty in the distribution of the Fleet.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he had made a statement on the general policy which had guided the Admiralty, and he did not think it necessary to add to or repeat the statement.

MR. RUNCIMAN did not wish to press the hon. Gentleman if he thought it improper to give the information, but he would mention one specific point, A large number of small vessels had been called in from distant stations and a considerable amount of policing work given up. Could he give any information on that point?

*MR. PRETYMAN said that was a matter of detail to which he would come in due course, but he did not propose to discuss further the general policy. The police work was of great value not only to the country, but also to the crews engaged, but the first necessity of a Navy was instant readiness for war. That involved the maintenance of Fleets in commission, and the maintenance of an efficient Reserve in instant readiness for war. After the men, stores, equipment, and so on necessary for those ships had been provided, if it could be afforded it would be very nice to have small ships scattered all over the world performing the useful, and, to some extent, important functions discharged by those ships to which the hon. Member had referred. But the country had to bear an enormous burden of naval expenditure, and if there was superadded to what was absolutely necessary for war that which was only desirable in peace, the burden might become unbearable. The efficiency of the Navy demanded the concentration of the existing *personnel* upon ships in commission and in the first line of defence, and that had involved the withdrawal of these ships from policing duties. The question of the bases was connected with the same principle. Every base was a source of expenditure, and, unless absolutely necessary, a source of weakness to a fleet in being. The increased mobility of the Fleet to which he referred last week enabled squadrons to command a much larger area without the multiplication of bases.

That brought him to the question of finance raised by the hon. Member for Dundee. The Admiralty had never claimed that the whole of the reduction in the Estimates was due to the new scheme. The hon. Member took the view that because the expenditure on the Chilian warships was exceptional it could not be counted in the reduction. But last year he complained of it as part of the increased expenditure on the Navy. He could not have it both ways. What the Admiralty contended was that at one and the same time they had increased the fighting efficiency of the Fleet and reduced the Navy Estimates by £3,500,000. The hon Member had referred to the reduction on stores.

The reduction of £110,000 for stores arose directly from reduction of bases and the setting free of stores there laid up, so there was not the necessity to purchase so largely in the coming year. Of course a very large proportion of the reduction of over £500,000 in the cost of repairs was due to the fact that the llama class would not require to be repaired in future. That was a very large direct saving. With regard to what had been said as to deterioration, he would remind the Committee that all the machinery would be painted so that the deterioration would be as little as possible, and he did not think the injury under this head would be very great. There would be caretakers on all these ships, and they would be gradually passed out of the class, because every year there would be a certain number of ships fall out of date from the first line of defence, and they would pass into Class 1*b*, which included ships with armaments which might be used for actual fighting. Ships in Class 2*a* could not be used for actual fighting, but only for subsidiary purposes in time of war. As other ships now in commission, or in commission in reserve, became less up-to-date, they would be removed into Class 1*b*., and the older ships would go down either into the sale list or into Class 2*a*., so there would be a constant interchange in this matter. It was quite true that these ships would deteriorate, but the only other alternative was to spend large sums keeping these ships actually in commission, and of the two courses the Admiralty had deliberately chosen the one which, while it was not absolutely costless, was far better viewed from the point of view of economy and efficiency, because it allowed the men and the money which would otherwise be spent on those ships to be devoted to the first line of defence. As to the large expenditure on repairs of particular ships, to which the hon. Member had referred, it would be better to deal with that subject on a later Vote; but in regard to the "Medea" and "Medusa" it was to be remembered that a large part of the expenditure was in the nature of experiment and was not purely for repairs. The ships were in commission, but they were also experimenting with new boilers, and the Admiralty had good value for the money in the results. As to other ships mentioned, of course it was necessary that ships in commission should be kept efficient, though, of course, it was competent for the hon. Member to say they should not have been kept in commission. It could not, however, be said that while in commission they should not be efficient for the service required from them.

As to the policy of new construction, the hon. Member would remember that the new construction already allocated could not be interfered with; but it would be seen that, of the figure of £1,370,000 for the new programme, £401,000 only was to go to the dockyards, and £968,000 was to be contracted for in the coming year.

*Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) asked what part of the saving was due to the new scheme of distribution.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said this was a question a little difficult to answer. The main reductions in Votes 8 and 9 were due to the swelling of the Votes last year. An additional reason was the omission, in view of changed conditions, of a fourth cruiser and certain additional destroyers. This was part of the general policy of the Admiralty, having regard to probable requirements, and the demand, on general grounds, not being so large for the coming year. In reply to the Questions put by his hon. friend the Member for Dundee, he wished to point out that on page 184, referring to the programme of ship building there was an item, "net value of stores issued." On page 91 the whole sum provided for new contruction is given, including material actually put into the ships, the labour, and contract work, but in addition sums for steamboats and transferable gun mountings not put into the ships before the end of the year. It also includes advances on such of these articles as are in course of manufacture. The new policy of concentration was partly responsible for it not being necessary to lay down so many ships as would have been necessary under the old scheme.

He disagreed entirely with the proposition laid down that it would have been better that the designs of the ships should have been dealt with by a tribunal of outsiders. As to the question of designing warships, he would most strongly urge that the greater part of the technical knowledge was within the walls of the Admiralty, and that there also the greatest experience was to be found. It was very desirable and important that by means of a Designs Committee of this kind the Admiralty should be able to draw in and to use some of the very valuable experience outside, and that was what had been done. But that was a very different thing from the Admiralty admitting that outsiders were competent to sit in judgment on the designs drawn up inside the Admiralty. The hon. Member had quoted the precedent of the Designs Committee appointed in 1871. He himself did not pretend to be familiar with all that occurred then, but what he had heard of that Committee would lead him to say that it was a precedent not to be followed, but rather one to be avoided. The reference to the Committee now proposed was drawn up by the Commanders-in-Chief of the Navy, in consultation with the First Sea Lord, and it necessarily included considerations regarding some of the most delicate points in naval strategy, which, after all, governed the designs of the ships which were to be built. It was obviously undesirable that these particular considerations should be laid before the public. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why?] He was afraid he could not say more if the hon. Gentleman could not understand what he had said.

The hon. Member for Devonport had raised a point in regard to night firing. He might tell the hon. Member that very great attention had been paid to that point, and that a new form of night sight had been adopted for which money was taken in these Estimates. The hon. Member had experience enough to know that real accuracy in night firing was not obtainable. With a search-light some approach to accuracy could be obtained, but without it any approach to accuracy was hardly possible. Practice at night with the Morris tube was going to be initiated. The difficulties in connection with firing at night were exceedingly great. Several hon. Members had raised the very important question of gun sights, and reference in this connection had been made to the "Centurion" and the "Barfleur." It was not so much a matter of sights as the fact that the gearing and the mountings of these ships were of such a character that, at the time they were designed, it was not realised the important effect they would have on the sights. It was impossible absolutely to prevent back lashing. The arrangement in connection with sights was a matter of difficulty, but he was glad to be able to assure the hon. Member that a new system of sighting and gearing had now been devised which was much simpler, and which, in the new ships, was giving great satisfaction. Another new system of gearing was being tried in the "Dominion," which could be fitted to the ships now in commission. It promised extremely well. In regard to the "Drake" sights, to which reference had been made, he had to say that they were being altered to meet some of the new improvements, and steps had been taken to have the work done quickly.

As to the administration of the dockyards, he would point out that it was stated in Lord Selborne's Memorandum that a Committee was to be appointed on that subject. Hon. Members would agree that it would be premature for him to discuss the question of dockyard administration, but any criticisms that might be made by hon. Members would be noted by the Admiralty, and all the points would be carefully considered. For him to lay down any policy before that Committee had reported would be absolutely useless. He would content himself with stating that the members of the Committee were—the First Sea Lord, Sir John Fisher, the Controller, Admiral Henderson, the Superintendent of Devonport, the Permanent Secretary of the Admiralty, the Director of Dockyards, the Accountant-General, and the Superintendent of the great Fairfield Yard.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): There is only one civilian, and the rest are all Admiralty men.

*MR. PRETYMAN said the Superintendent of Fairfield Yard was the only one outside the Admiralty. As to the policy with respect to repairs, the hon.

Member for Islington had asked what was the change. It was stated at the time that the policy of having repairs executed in private yards was a temporary one, and that it was undertaken to overtake arrears which were due to the introduction of Belleville boilers. These arrears had now been entirely wiped off. The hon. Member for Dewsbury had frequently pointed out in the House the costly nature of the policy of resorting to private yards for repairs. He was perfectly ready to admit that experience had shown it was a costly policy, and that the hon. Member's criticism was perfectly justified. The hon. Member would be glad to know that it would not be needful to resort to it again. He did not admit, however, that the Admiralty were not justified in resorting to it as a temporary expedient.

MR. KEARLEY: For the past three years you denied that it was more costly.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he did not deny it. They had not the results before them in individual cases, but experience had shown that it was more costly to have the work done in private yards. If the work could have been done in the Royal dockyards it would have been cheaper.

The question as to what was to be done at Rosyth was more appropriate to the Loans Bill which would be introduced at a later date. He would only say that nothing had occurred since this date last year which in any way reduced the value of Rosyth in the opinion of the Admiralty. On the contrary, recent changes had rather accentuated the eventual value of Rosyth as a naval base, but whether the reduction of the number of ships which would now require to be berthed would enable the Admiralty to some extent to postpone expenditure he was not prepared at that moment to say. It would not be finally decided until the Loan Bill had been introduced whether they would be able to carry out large works there as early as they had expected, but the value of Rosyth was clear and undoubted in the view of the Admiralty.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) asked what was to be done as to Chatham and Bermuda.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he must leave the question of Chatham to be discussed on the Loan Bill.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) asked what the Admiralty proposed to do in regard to the establishments at Halifax and Jamaica which were to be abolished.

*MR. PRETYMAN said the establishments would remain without men or stores; but, should the necessity arise, they could send men and stores out there. There was no expense proposed to be incurred except for caretakers.

MR. BUCHANAN said caretakers did not appear in the Estimates.

*MR. PRETYMAN said there was no specific charge. They did not put a special item in the Dockyard Vote for caretakers. The function of the Naval Volunteers was to learn as far as possible the duties which they would have to perform on board ship, and when necessity required mobilisation they would be drafted to ships of war and would perform a part, and a very useful part, in the general working of the ships.

The hon. Members for King's Lynn, Dundee, and Great Yarmouth had raised a point as to the redistribution of duties within the Board of Admiralty itself. There had been rather a misapprehension on the subject. The hon. Member for Dundee was quite accurate in saying that there had been undue importance attached to it. So far as there was any alteration, it lay in the sense of relieving the First Sea Lord, as far as possible, of detail duties. It would be remembered that the First Sea Lord was necessarily an important member of the newly created Committee of Defence. This involved constant attendance on that Committee, and the whole object of the change had been to relieve the First Sea Lord of duties which could be as well performed by others, leaving him with the sole care of the efficiency of the Fleet and its instant readiness for war. The note at the end of the Vote implied that if any proposal were made by any other member of the Board of Admiralty which would have some effect on the instant readiness of the Fleet for war, it would not be desirable that that member should exercise his authority to carry out the change without having first referred it to the First Sea Lord. The whole principle of the working of the Board of Admiralty was that ordinary minor departmental matters were dealt with by the individual members of the Board, and if any matter was of great importance there was joint responsibility by two, three, or four members of the Board. But where the matter was of a character which affected the particular province of the First Sea Lord that must be brought before him.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said that, assuming a naval Lord brought forward a matter from his department to which the First Sea Lord objected, would that prevent the matter going to the First Lord of the Admiralty?

*MR. PRETYMAN said no, clearly not. Exactly the contrary would be the case. The First Sea Lord had no power whatever when that matter was referred to him to decide. There was joint responsibility between him and the member whose department had referred it to him. If they were agreed on the point, it might not be considered necessary to refer the matter further; but if they were not agreed, the matter was referred to the First Lord of the Admiralty or to the Board of Admiralty as a whole. As to comparing the First Sea Lord to the Commander-in-Chief of the Army, he hoped the present practice would long continue. When the First Sea Lord went down to a dockyard he wore a top hat; and the wearing of a top hat marked that he was there as an administrative and not as an executive authority. The mark of the executive authority was the wearing of a uniform.

A discussion had been raised as to the position of the new Inspector of Target Practice in relation to the First Sea Lord. The appointment of that Inspector was solely and entirely made with reference to the improvement of the gunnery of the Fleet. The Inspector would have no executive authority. When he visited the Fleet he would be under the Commander-in-Chief of the Fleet, and every report that he made would be made through the Commander-in-Chief. He would be able to do something to assist in co-ordinating the methods of shooting and introducing the very latest improvements in one part of the Navy to all parts. He was not an Admiralty officer; his salary as an ordinary Admiral would be on Vote 1, and his headquarters would be at Portsmouth. His name had not been attached to any particular ship. As the Naval Ordnance Department was specially in the province of the First Sea Lord, it was perfectly clear that his immediate chief would be the First Sea Lord.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that in order to elucidate the point, might he ask if the Inspector of Target Practice would not be an Admiralty officer.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that the Inspector was not an Admiralty officer in the sense that he was not domiciled at the Admiralty, and would not be borne on Vote 12, which was the Admiralty Vote. He was an executive officer of the Admiralty and as such primarily under the Admiral commanding the particular Fleet with which for the time being he is connected.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked if the Board of Admiralty could dismiss him if they wished?

*MR. PRETYMAN said that the Board of Admiralty could dismiss any naval officer and this one not more than any other.

MR. KEARLEY said that the Secretary to the Admiralty had stated that the sending of ships for repairs to private yards was only a temporary policy. That was not what was said last year. The plan was that of Admiral May, who held that it would be a saving to send ships for repair to the yards where they had been built. That seemed a sensible course, but it had been very costly. The hon. Member for Dewsbury had called attention to the extraordinary waste of money going on for repairs, not because the repairs were done in private yards, but because the Admiralty did not take the ordinary business method of calling for estimates, but had allowed the private yards to work at schedule prices. A Committee had been appointed to overhaul the dockyard administration, but it consisted entirely of Admiralty men with one notable exception. No fresh ideas were likely, in these circumstances, to be imported from the outside, and the vision of the Admiralty in that respect was rather narrow. A larger proportion of the Committee should have been appointed from the outside. The system of the Government dockyards being controlled by naval men was not a good one. There was no continuity of policy. One man came who was a reformer, and then another would be appointed who liked things to go on pleasantly. That was not the system which prevailed in private yards. He went over a Government dockyard the other day with the admiral-superintendent, and saw some of the reforms that had been introduced. He was shown a sawing-mill, and was told that when that superintendent first went there he found the timber was stacked three-quarters of a mile from the mill, and had to be brought there at a great waste of time and money.

As regarded the llama class, he did not like the word. Both officers and men called this Fleet the "forlorn hope fleet," which was a more comprehensible and intelligible title. It was not to be called into being until the first line had been exhausted. That really meant until the first line was beaten. It would, nevertheless, involve an enormous amount of wasteful expenditure. The hon. Gentleman mentioned that this "forlorn hope fleet" could be got ready in three months. He was assured it could not be got ready under four or six months, especially as the light armament would be removed from the vessels. But what use would these ships be if the first line were exhausted. He did not believe that the first line would ever be exhausted; and, therefore, to maintain this policy would be very wasteful, and involve expenditure to no purpose. If steps were only to be taken when the first line was exhausted to get the "forlorn hope fleet" ready, that would not be much security for the country to depend on. There would naturally have to be a weeding out of this decaying materiale very year. He was not condemning the policy; but there appeared to be an extraordinary lack of foresight on the part of the Admiralty in spending thousands of pounds on the repairs of these ships while this policy was maturing. It could not have been arrived at at twenty-four hours notice. It was pretty notorious that it had been settled upon; yet the Admiralty continued to spend thousands of pounds on repairs which they might have spared. For instance, the "Retribution" was reboilered and refitted, and soon afterwards sent to the scrap heap. It was only a question of time when the ships in the "forlorn hope fleet" would be superannuated and not worth the water on which they floated from a naval point of view. Then a new sloop which was only commissioned in 1902 was sent to the scrap heap, and he understood that fifteen other vessels of the type had been constructed at a cost of between £60,000 and £80,000. Reference had been made in the First Lord's Statement to more rapid construction; but, curiously enough, it was mentioned that a vessel of the "Lord Nelson" class had been given to the Palmer Company to build and that it would be completed in three years. That was not a good illustration of rapidity of construction, especially as the Government yards were able to complete a ship in two years.

As regarded torpedo boats, it was stated that the Board of Admiralty had decided to combine speed and sea-keeping power. Last session, he called attention to the danger of the policy the Admiralty were adopting in diminishing the speed of torpedo boats, whereas every other nation of naval standing was increasing their torpedo boat speed. The Japanese boats which were built in England had a speed of thirty-one or thirty-two knots, whereas the speed of our boats was reduced from thirty knots to twenty-five. The Committee was aware of the cause. Defects were developed in some of the torpedo boats, notably in the "Cobra" class. They were badly designed and of inferior workmanship and material. That was well known. The Admiralty had not admitted it; but they had appointed a Committee to inquire into the matter. Last session the hon. Gentleman denied that there was any comparison to be drawn between our torpedo boats and those of Japan; yet the Japanese boats travelled thousands of miles of ocean and arrived safely in the Far East, and were engaged in the early part of the war against the Russian Fleet with a considerable amount of success. Last session he suggested that it would be possible to have in torpedo boats sea-keeping power combined with considerable speed; and the hon. Gentleman replied that the most eminent experts declared that they could not design a boat of greater strength and greater speed.

*MR. PRETYMAN said at anything like the same cost.

MR. KEARLEY said that cost did not enter into the question. He was glad that the Admiralty had changed their policy. He did not object, as the change was in the right direction. It was strange, however, that he should be told on August 4th, 1904, that great firms had stated their inability to construct vessels of sea-keeping power and high speed; and then to read in the First Lord's Statement that this very class of vessel was being ordered. They were always told when it was a question of getting the most effective weapon that it was a question of cost. Cost did not enter into the question. Surely they were not to be told now that last year we could not afford thirty-two-knot boats. That was what the hon. Gentleman was saying now. When confronted by his own words of last year, the hon. Member turned round and said the cost was too great. The real reason why we could not get the best boat last year was because the specification was limited by the length of the boat, and the Admiralty specified for an excessive thickness of the hull. What was this new type of "sea-keeping quality and greater speed?" He would be glad if the hon. Gentleman could give some further particulars with regard to it. In the First Lord's Memorandum he saw we were to have one boat as an experiment of "great speed and sea-keeping qualities."

*MR. PRETYMAN: No, no! One experimental boat, but there are to be five other boats of high speed and sea-keeping qualities. One is an experimental boat, but there are to be six boats in all.

MR. KEARLEY: Are those the five boats which were in the programme of last year or five new ones?

*MR. PRETYMAN: If the hon. Gentleman pleases, five new ones.

MR. KEARLEY: No, it is not what I please. There is some point in my question. The five boats of last year were to be 25-knot boats.

*MR. PRETYMAN: At that time?

MR. KEARLEY: Are those boats the same as the ones now alluded to?

*MR. PRETYMAN: Those five boats are eliminated altogether, and there are to be five boats of high speed and sea-keeping qualities in their place.

MR. KEARLEY said he was glad, at all events, to have elicited that fact. The Government had now abandoned those old slow-going boats. The 25-knot boat had passed away, and we were now going to have boats of high speed which could compete with the fleets of the world.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said the Estimates laid before the House and the country this year were of abnormal interest. He had read very carefully the Papers issued and had studied the Estimates for the coming year, and was glad to find himself in a position of almost unqualified agreement with the proposals which the Board of Admiralty had made. Last year he expressed the opinion that the expenditure might be reduced without diminishing the efficiency of the Fleet, and he was glad to find that the Government had reduced the Estimates by £3,500,000, and that that had been done without any detraction from the fighting efficiency of the Fleet. It had been effected by the new disposition of the Fleet and the placing out of commission of a certain number of vessels which were not necessary to our security. He would like to give his hon. friend one hint with regard to this reduction. When a reduction of this kind exactly hit off a large round figure, it rather smacked of a prior arrangement. Strongly as he was in favour of economy, he disliked the policy of attempting to enforce it by reducing aggregates without having regard to the amount appropriated to each item. That was the policy which was pursued with great detriment to the Navy many years ago, and which resulted in millions of money being sacrificed for the want of a few thousands of pounds. A great deal of exaggerated language had been used about the distribution of the Fleet. What had been done was simply to give effective development to the principles which had been in force in the Admiralty for many years. Where the present Board of Admiralty had the advantage over preceding Boards was that they had effected large expenditure during recent years, which had given them the benefit of a properly equipped dock at Gibraltar and had enabled that to be made a base of considerable magnitude. They also had the advantage of a large number of armoured cruisers, and they could supersede the fleets of small cruisers which were scattered over the world. He objected to the British Navy's doing police work for the rest of the world. There was no need whatever for us to lock up capable officers and men in obsolete vessels in out-of-the-way stations of the world, and the Admiralty were now able to utilise lieutenant commanders for separate commands in torpedo boats rather than in policing distant parts of the world. He thought the more these proposals were looked at the more they would be liked.

The Admiralty had also made it clear that it was essential in modern warfare that fleets should be concentrated. Our Fleet had first to assert its fighting superiority, and then it could give adequate protection to commerce. We could go to distant parts of the world and assert our presence with one or two of these big vessels with much greater effect than three or four little gun-boats. There was an illustration of that some years ago. We sent two vessels with four funnels each up the Persian Gulf and they created a very great impression, until some ingenious Russian discovered that Russia had a vessel with five funnels which was then sent up the Gulf, and he was told made a much greater impression. A large number of persons thought that because we commanded the sea, merchant vessels would be as immune from attack in time of war as in time of peace, but although we had numerous vessels it was absolutely essential, if we were fighting for naval supremacy, that our Fleet should be concentrated at certain places, no matter what happened to our commerce. The Admiralty deserved credit for getting rid of a considerable number of small and detached bases and naval dockyards abroad. It was a delusion to suppose that the more naval bases we had the better would it be for our Fleet. If we looked at the lessons of the Russo-Japanese War we might fairly say that if Russia had only had one naval base instead of two in the Pacific the Japanese would not have got the command of the sea as soon as they did.

With regard to the vessels which it was proposed to place on the scrap heap, the Admiralty, on further consideration, might decide to preserve one or two of them. If they desired to combine efficiency with economy it was absolutely necessary to pay great attention to designs. In some cases the hasty adoption of new designs had led to terrible waste of money. He could give an illustration of this. There were two vessels designed twenty-five years ago; they each cost about £700,000 for their armament. Neither of those vessels, so defective was their design, had been in active commission except for naval manœuvres. For many years they had been detached for use as tenders to the gunnery school at Devonport where any wooden vessel would have done just as well. He thought we were bound to admit that we had adhered too long to the large unarmoured cruisers, and that we had not given sufficient attention to giving them armaments in proportion to their displacement. Therefore he welcomed the idea of a Committee of Designs to apply the lessons of the recent naval war. He hoped that great benefit would be derived from this Committee, and that the Admiralty would consider the propriety of forming a small permanent Committee to which designs should be referred. He did not wish to impair the responsibility of the Chief Constructor of the

Navy, but it practically meant that the safety of the whole British Empire was upon one man, and he thought it was more than one man could do to be responsible for an expenditure of £10,000,000 a year.

With regard to the distribution of business there seemed to be an impression that the *status* of the Naval Lords other than the Senior Lord would be modified under the present arrangement. Sir John Fisher was a man of immense initiative, great energy, and an unbounded capacity for work, and Lord Cawdor, he was confident, would develop into a most efficient First Lord. But the circumstances were peculiar. The Senior Naval Lord alone of the Naval Lords had a seat on the Committee of Defence, so that he was no longer *primus inter pares*, Lord Cawdor might have been singularly successful with the management of a great railway, but it would be a profound mistake ever to attempt to manage the Navy on the principle of the general management of a railway. The Board of Admiralty had done extraordinarily well when left alone, but twice within his experience it had broken down. One occasion was when Mr. Childers got rid of the old Board and tried to work the Admiralty himself with two assistants; the other was in 1885, when Lord Northbrook, the then First Lord, had to go abroad on a diplomatic mission. Sir Cooper Key, the Senior Naval Lord, a man of exceptional ability and extraordinary power of work, who undertook the duty of practically managing the whole Admiralty, gave the go-by to the other Naval Lords, and tried to work the Admiralty through civilian officials. It went on till the country was on the verge of war with Russia, and then the whole fabric broke down. He (the speaker) was suddenly appointed First Lord; the Admiralty was in a state of chaos; a special Committee, of which Lord Goschen was chairman, was appointed to examine into the matter, and made certain suggestions. He was fortunate enough to have the assistance of a singularly able body of officers as Naval Lords, and the first thing they did was to put the Naval Lords back into their old position. That position was a somewhat peculiar one. Each Naval Lord was responsible for the executive work of the department of which he was the head, and had civilian assistants to help discharge the work. The Board of Admiralty met for consultation and advisory purposes, and the Naval Lords were in a position of perfect equality. He attached the greatest importance to that equality of *status*. It was that which had made the Board of Admiralty efficient, and it was the lack of that equality which had rendered the War Office inefficient. There were in the Navy two schools—a young school and an old school—and the probability was that the old school would be more represented by the Senior Naval Lords than by the Junior Naval Lords. If the First Lord were a sensible man, and had free access to the inner mind of the Junior Lords, he would very often get hold of some ideas of the young school which, if put forward in his name, the Senior Lords would at once accept, while they might dislike to take them up if the ideas originated primarily from the Junior Lords. At the War Office, on the other hand, the moment a military officer was put in the position of Commander-in-Chief, or in a position of dominance over others, the sense of loyalty was such that the junior officers would never give an opinion contrary to that of their seniors. That was a state of things which should be prevented at the Admiralty. He did not say there was any likelihood of its happening, but when changes were being made it was as well to take care that they did not drift into a system which nobody desired.

With regard to dockyard administration, he was surprised by the statement in Lord Selborne's Memorandum that new construction could be carried out more cheaply in private yards than in dockyards. He fully agreed that with so large a Fleet in commission it was advisable that the dockyards should do the greater part of the repairs, but he submitted that dockyards would never be thoroughly efficient unless they were given a considerable amount of the new construction. Dockyards ought to be able to build more cheaply than private yards. They had to find no interest on capital, they could buy materials when prices were lowest, and they had a most efficient body of workmen. He would like his hon. friend to explain how it was that dockyards had gone back while private yards had gone forward. He hoped a large portion of the work in the yards would be new construction, as it was very discouraging to first-class establishments to find themselves confined to mere repairing work.

It was stated to be the desire of the Admiralty to derive as much benefit as possible from the lessons taught by the war between Japan and Russia. There was one lesson which he hoped the Government would take seriously to heart. Our fighting sea-going Fleet was, from the point of view of efficiency, stronger than it had ever been, but it was no use having that strength and efficiency if there was associated with it an ineffective system of harbour defence. It was through the inefficiency of harbour defence at Port Arthur at the commencement of the war that the Japanese were able to go in to torpedo the Russian fleet and to prevent it ever again fighting on terms of equality. He unhesitatingly declared that our system of defence of our naval bases was inefficient and indefensible. It was in the hands of the military authorities. At Portsmouth there was an aggregation of the most powerful ships in the world; there were a number of officers who in ability of knowledge could not be surpassed in the world, and yet in time of war the movement of ships in and out of the Solent would be controlled not by naval officers but by the military officers who for the moment happened to be in command at Portsmouth. There was not another nation in the world who would dream of having so ridiculous a system, and yet our Navy was of far greater importance to us than the navy of any other nation was to them. The Admiralty admitted that submarine warfare was being rapidly developed and that it was by submarines that harbours would be defended and attacked. How was it possible for military officers or engineers to know anything about submarines? Nor was that all. We had a magnificent force in the Marines. The officers were a most capable body, but their prospects were poor, and the country got very little benefit from their ability and talents because they were never employed after they had attained a certain rank. In Portsmouth, Plymouth, and Chatham there were numbers of Marine officers who understood the movements of ships and the management of heavy guns; they alone of officers on shore had that double knowledge, and yet they were the one class who were never allowed to go inside the forts. Was that common sense? When at the Admiralty he effected a change which became the foundation of the present system of naval reserves. They found a number of ships in reserve tumbling to pieces for want of attention, and men on hulks doing nothing but clean decks. They brought the men to the ships which wanted attention, and that principle had been greatly amplified and developed by successive Boards of Admiralty. In the same way there were these Marine officers and the forts, and he hoped the matter would be borne in mind. He did not press the Government for an answer now; he knew the difficulty of the matter. He himself had tried to effect a change by getting the duties transferred to the Navy, but he was opposed by both military and naval experts. The system, however, was indefensible, and he intended to raise the matter on the Army Estimates, when he hoped to be able to convince the Committee that it ought not to be allowed to exist any longer. Meanwhile he hoped the Secretary of State for War, who had many problems to solve, would not in his future alterations of the Army take such steps as would preclude any reform of the kind he had suggested. In conclusion, he congratulated the Secretary to the Admiralty on having presented to the House a Statement and a document combining with a higher degree than any other Naval Statement of recent years the attributes of efficiency, progress, and economy.

Mr. BENN (Devonport) desired to associate himself with the protest of the noble Lord against the policy of reducing the Royal dockyards to repairing shops. In Lord Selborne's Statement there appeared a passage of serious import, viz.—

> "The first business of the Royal dockyards is to keep the Fleet in repair, and accordingly the amount of new construction allotted to those dockyards should be subordinated to this main consideration."

He should like to learn the true import of those words. The following sentence went on to say that in the United Kingdom they had a splendid national asset in the numerous private yards; that new construction could be as cheaply executed in them as in the Royal dockyards; and that repairs were more economically effected in the Royal than in private dockyards. That statement gave him surprise and alarm. He agreed that they had in their private dockyards a magnificent national asset, but if the Admiralty pursued the policy of starving the Royal dockyards that would be fatal to national efficiency. He hoped they would receive some assurance that whilst giving every encouragement to the private yards the Government would maintain a fair proportion of shipbuilding in their own dockyards, which in the past had contributed so much to the strength of the Navy. The testimony of the noble Lord the Member for Ealing was very remarkable. They were all aware of the inadequacy of the machinery and the red tape which impeded work in the Royal dockyards, but it was a fact that they could build cheaper there than in private yards, and he hoped the Royal dockyards would receive the first consideration when new ships were laid down.

Since he had had the opportunity and the honour of looking into dockyard matters he had been very much distressed at the cumbersome way in which those associated with the lower grades of labour had to make their wishes and wants known to the authorities. The Department received once a year curious documents known as "humble petitions." They were given a more or less considered answer, and those in the lower walks of labour were constantly in a condition of doubt and disappointment. One of the duties of the new Committee, which was to see to the organisation of our dockyards, would be to provide a suitable and proper way of enabling the workers to state their case, and he should like something in the nature of a trade council established. He could, if necessary, cite different rates of pay for identical labour, and all sorts of grievances and anachronisms existed in the service which could be settled by such methods as he had indicated. He hoped that some means would be found of getting rid of this old-fashioned method of petitioning, and of giving the men an opportunity of coming before those who employed them in order that the rates of pay might be made fair all round. He had nothing to say against the new naval policy, for he had always been in favour of a strong and an efficient Navy, but these sudden strokes of the pen meant a great deal of suffering to some of those who served the State in the humbler ranks of the Civil Service. It was a serious business to have in midwinter in Devonport something like 450 men discharged. In this introduction of a new policy more consideration should be shown to those who had served under the State in the lower ranks of labour. Speaking from the labour point of view, he hoped that this new programme would lead not only to efficiency in naval affairs, but also to a greater consideration for those who worked in the Royal dockyards.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley) said he did not think any previous Board of Admiralty had shown itself so practical as the present Board, and he did not think the Admiralty would ever adopt any other policy than one which contained a proper intermixture of building and repairing in the Royal dockyards. He would not like this discussion to conclude without placing upon record his humble testimony to the satisfactory progress which had been made in naval affairs, and also his high appreciation of the services of one who had just retired from office. Lord Selborne took charge of the supreme direction of the Navy at a time when it was in an admittedly efficient condition, and perhaps the difficulties of Lord Selborne's task were rendered all the greater because of that efficiency; therefore the praise to be given to him ought to be increased because Lord Selborne commenced his term of office with the Navy in a high state of efficiency, and he had left it in a still higher state of efficiency, particularly as regarded *personnel*, the change in the arrangements for executive and engineer officers, the creation of a new section of reserves, an enormous increase in the number and efficiency of the reserves, and very little increase in the expenditure in time of peace. Besides this there had been the inevitable increase in the amount of new construction. For all these things the greatest credit was due to Lord Selborne, and they would form a permanent monument to the wisdom with which he had administered the affairs of the Navy. He only hoped that the new First Lord of the Admiralty would be equally successful. The appointment of Earl Cawdor formed quite a new departure in the system of selection of First Lords of the Admiralty, because there had been in the past no sort of connection beeween Lord Cawdor and the Navy. Nevertheless, the selection of the noble Lord who had been so successful an administrator for some ten years in one of the largest railways in the Kingdom, during which time that railway had prospered exceedingly, was a very excellent omen for his success in dealing with the Navy. They all hoped on the Ministerial side of the House that Earl Cawdor might have a lengthened time in which to show his ability to confer some benefits upon the Navy, but whether that time was long or short he believed there were many hon. Members who sympathised with the system which the First Lord of the Treasury had inaugurated of selecting a man who had a successful business career behind him for directing one of the most important offices of State.

The Naval Budget was remarkable chiefly for one thing, and that was the economy of so large a sum as £3,500,000. The hon. Member for Dundee, opposite, sought to belittle this economy, and pointed out that it arose from a reduction of Vote 8 for naval construction. The First Lord of the Admiralty in his Memorandum stated that that reduction was principally due to economy. That economy was possible on account of recent events in the Far East, which had rendered it unnecessary for this country to lay down so many ships as were necessary in former years, and would have been necessary again but for the fact that a very large proportion of one of the fighting fleets of the world had been crippled and destroyed. He thought the Government deserved sympathy and support, and a definite expression of support, from the Ministerial side of the House, and particularly from those who had urged in former years the necessity of taking advantage of the very first opportunity possible of economising in the new construction programme when the balance of the British Fleet with other fleets made it possible to do so. There was no doubt some economy in the llama system of laying up ships, and he understood that there was no intention of departing from the system that where ships were absolutely useless, with no reasonable prospect of ever coming into the fighting line again, they would be sold and broken up. In respect of ships which had some reasonable prospects of being usable in the future, he thought the system which the Admiralty had inaugurated for the first time of laying up a large number of ships at a comparatively small expenditure for maintenance was a new system which would work well and assist in making adequate naval preparation, and in providing them with vessels which might be used in times of emergency and maintained at a minimum cost in time of peace.

There were one or two items in the explanatory Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty to which attention had not, as yet, been very fully called. The first of these was the statement that the Special Committee upon Dockyard Administration was intended to bring about, if possible, a full decentralisation, so as to make the admirals superintending the dockyards more responsible for the work of the particular yards under their charge. That was to say, that each dockyard was to be more self-contained and to enter into competition with the other dockyards in regard to economy and speed of construction, and generally as regarded efficiency. If that object could be carried out he believed it would be a very desirable thing, and the object which the hon. Member for Devonport had in view of securing greater efficiency in the dockyards would be promoted by a healthy rivalry between the rival dockyards. He thought in this way that the Committee would ultimately do an excellent service.

There was another equally important statement on page 4, in which reference was made to the steady increase in respect of the Royal Naval Reserve and of the Royal Fleet Reserve. That was the direction which had been so often urged in that House by his right hon. friend the Member for Great Yarmouth, namely, that every effort should be made by the Admiralty to bring about more co-operation with the Colonies in regard to naval defence. This contribution differed considerably from what had been advocated by his right hon. friend, but it was one which had not been forced from them in any way, and that, to his mind, was much more valuable, because, besides being a contribution of men and some of the expense, it was a manifestion of patriotism in the Colonies.

The noble Lord the Member for Ealing had referred with approval to the establishment of the Committee of Designs by the present Board of Admiralty. He himself could not wholly support the appointment of that Committee, because he believed it would have the effect of largely reducing the responsibility of the Director of Naval Construction. That would be a great calamity. When that Committee was brought in to share with the Director of Naval Construction the responsibility for carrying out the duties of his office, they lowered the importance of his office and created a precedent which might be extremely dangerous. Reference had been made to a Committee which was formerly appointed, but he would point out that that was done under entirely different circumstances. There had been attacks made on the designs for naval construction and the Committee, which consisted of independent experts, was called in to report. In the case of the Committee now appointed there would be no Report, or, if there was, it would be kept secret. As to the Royal yacht, on whose style of construction so many attacks were made in that House at the time it was built, it was now an established fact that it was a great success in yacht building, and he thought the utmost prominence should be given to that statement because Sir William White, who had been particularly attacked in connection with the matter, took the full responsibility on himself at the time in the most chivalrous manner. There were some, indeed, who thought that he showed undue generosity in taking full responsibility on himself. The fact that the yacht had proved an entire success showed, after all, that little or no weight was to be attached to the criticisms of those who formerly commented adversely on Sir William White's scientific work.

Sir Fortescue Flannery.

The First Lord's Memorandum referred to the importance of oil fuel. It was destined to play a very important part in the future of the Fleet, because it practically doubled the range of a vessel's operations. In other words, if a ship was capable of carrying sufficient coal to steam across the Atlantic, and then required to re-coal for the return voyage, by substituting liquid fuel for coal the ship would be able to cross the Atlantic and come back again without renewing its supply. One great difficulty which attended the adoption of oil fuel in the British Fleet was that we had not under the British flag any territory which produced petroleum. [An Hon. Member: Yes]. Perhaps his hon. friend referred to Burma, where there was petroliferous territory, but so far the power of production had been limited, and the full extent of that source had not yet been proved. He urged that the Admiralty should co-operate with the Foreign Office and the India Office in increasing to the fullest possible extent the area from which liquid fuel might be obtained. The restriction which had recently been imposed on Burma was not in the best interests of the Navy. Certain British corporations were ready and willing to explore the liquid fuel resources of Burma, but, unfortunately, the Admiralty had not shown them the encouragement they might have done. Taking the Statement of the First Lord as a whole and the speeches of the Secretary to the Admiralty, they should create confidence in the House and country that whatever might be the difficulties at the War Office, we had at the Admiralty an organisation amply prepared for the discharge of all the duties of naval administration.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said he did not wish to follow the hon. Gentleman, who had just sat down, into the question of the use of oil for the Navy, or into that general and unbounded praise of the Admiralty and all connected with the Admiralty with which he concluded his speech. It was remarkably that throughout the debate—one of the most important epochs in the history of the Navy—they had had nothing like an epoch-making speech from any representative of the Admiralty. He freely acknowledged that the Secretary to the Admiralty had, with his usual courtesy, answered all the smaller points which had been put to him; but on the general policy which underlay those changes he had refrained from giving them anything like the requisite amount of information which would enable the Committee to form a clear judgment on the problems presented for their consideration. We were now in a time of great revolution. We had re-grouped our fleets. We had discarded something like 160 ships from our fighting line. We had relieved the congestion of our dockyards. We had altered the system under which we repaired and rebuilt our ships. Those changes were described, on high authority, as of the greatest moment. And yet the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty thought it inadvisable, in the House to which he was answerable for the policy of the Admiralty, to lay down the principles which had guided the Admiralty in the changes they had instituted. Here, he fancied, the hon. Gentleman was legitimately afraid of the charge of inconsistency. In the first place, he was afraid of the charge of inconsistency as regarded Rosyth, for whenever that subject was referred to he shirked it judiciously. The story of Rosyth had been told very well by the hon. Member for King's Lynn. In 1903 a statement was made by Lord Elgin, after an interview with the Admiralty, that when the naval base at Rosyth was completed there would be 30,000 or 40,000 bluejackets stationed there, and he went on to say that he had had a conference on the previous afternoon with the officials at the Admiralty, and was informed that it would not be wise to lay down pipes for a water supply for a population of less than 30,000 in the next thirty years. Only as late as December last, Lord Selborne, in writing to a Member of that House, said that since the scheme was sanctioned in 1903 much had happened which had accentuated the future importance of Rosyth in regard to the Navy. It was really absurd for the hon. Gentleman to say that the views of the Admiralty with regard to Rosyth had not undergone very serious changes. He had no doubt the hon. Member was rather nervous of the charge of inconsistency.

He came to another question. It was only a year ago since the South Atlantic squadron was formed under the present arrangement; a separate squadron, then, would be no longer required. He had no complaint to make of these changes of policy. He thought they were good; but the hon. Gentleman should have the courage to say that they had changed their minds, and that they were justified in doing so, and should have also given the Committee the requisite reasons for the change. The hon. Gentleman occasionally talked about continuity of policy, but he supposed he did not refer to such items as he had mentioned. It was very remarkable that the policy which the Admiralty advocated last year, and held up to last autumn, had suffered a complete change immediately Sir John Fisher was appointed. Those changes had been put down to the genius of Lord Selborne. He did not wish to detract from the ability of Lord Selborne; but it was apparent to the world that those changes were coincident with the appearance of Sir John Fisher once more at Whitehall. Year after year the Admiralty had always resented any criticism of the total amount spent on the Navy. They had occupied a position of great privilege in the House. They had been to a large extent free from criticism. The danger that was run by withholding information was that the faith in the Admiralty's judgment had been seriously damaged. The one thing he should deplore would be that the faith of the country in the Admiralty should suffer the same shock that people's faith in the War Office suffered during the South African War. One of the matters which he had urged was that we might quite advisedly drop one of the battleships of the "King Edward VIIth" type. Nothing would have been wiser than to have waited until the war in the Far East had proceeded for some little time in order that we might have benefited from the lessons to be learned there. And yet we were told that to drop one of these battleships would have been a dangerous expedient! They urged that it would be unwise to accelerate the pace of the shipbuilding, first, because we had bought two Chilian battleships; secondly, because the Russian navy had been considerably weakened; and thirdly, because we could build better in 1905 than in 1904. They were told that there was no time to be lost. The Admiralty even embarked on building two more ships of the "King Edward VIIth" type when they had decided to build more ships of the improved "Lord Nelson" type. He understood that these latter had not yet been commenced. He wanted to know why, if no time was to be lost last year, these ships were not only deferred from August to January, but even now were not under construction. Then they urged also that the amount of money spent on repairs was far in excess of the value received. When they raised that point the hon. Gentleman said that the reason for repairing vessels in private yards was not merely that the dockyards were overcrowded, but that they wished to send the vessels back to the yards where they had been originally constructed. The ground for that apparently was bad, the expedient was extravagant, and he was glad the policy had now been dropped. The reason why they objected to these vessels going into private yards was not to deprive private yards of the work, but that the "time and material" basis was an extravagant one, and that it bound the Government to a certain extent to the private yards, and that it was bound to work out extravagantly. Nothing had been said as to what was to be done with the new Cunarders. They would like to know if the present Board of Admiralty had the same high opinion of the value of those vessels in time of war as their predecessors. This was one of those things in which there was room for criticism. He believed the original reasons which prompted the Admiralty to embark on this scheme were not naval reasons at all, but were the result of the great trade revolution on the Atlantic, at which some hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House had been bold enough to smile.

In his opinion the reasons given for the redistribution of the Fleet were utterly inadequate to explain the great changes that had been made. It had been said that the real reason for the redistribution of the Fleet was to be found in the reliability of wireless telegraphy. But there was no doubt, whether wireless telegraphy had become reliable or not, the Admiralty was moved in the first instance by the alteration that had taken place in strategical geography. There had been a great change in the strength of the navies of the world and he had no doubt that that was the main motive in the mind of the Admiralty for the scheme of redistribution. They might also have been moved by the fact that the increase of torpedo stations in the Mediterranean and the introduction of submarines had made dangerous some of our most important stations and waters upon which we thought we were supreme. The hon. Gentleman had truly said that in calling in some of the more distant vessels and dropping a great deal of the police work he had set free a large number of officers and men; but if this revolution was necessary, if it had added to the strength of the Fleet, and at the same time had reduced the money spent upon it, why on earth was it not thought of two or three years previously? Many of the reasons urged to-day were just as applicable then. Those who thought we were building sufficiently fast were prepared to pour scorn on any figures of comparison, and those who thought we were building too slow would always appeal to them. It was only by a study of numerical comparisons that we could gauge our strength. To show the relatively powerful position which we occupied, he would just compare our Fleet with the fleets of Germany, France, and the United States. Taking the battleships under twenty-five years of age ready on January 18th, 1905, Great Britain had no less than fifty-six battleships of 742,000 tons; France had twenty-eight; Germany, seventeen; and the United States, fourteen; *i.e.*, those three great Powers had together fifty-nine battleships, of 1,617,000 tons, whereas we had fifty-six battleships, of 742,000 tons; so that we were almost up to the three-Power standard. Taking armoured cruisers of twenty years of age, the three Powers together had twenty-five vessels, of 202,000 tons, whereas we had twenty-eight vessels, of 258,000 tons, so that we were well up to the three-Power standard. But let them look two or three years ahead, and take the vessels which would be ready on April 18th, 1908. Here they had another very interesting comparison. He found that on that date

Great Britain would have sixty-one battleships, of 850,000 tons; France, twenty-nine; the United States, twenty-six; and Germany, twenty-three; *i.e.*, those three Powers would have seventy-eight battleships, whereas we should have sixty-one, this being well over the two-Power standard and close up to the three-Power standard. In armoured cruisers we should have seventy-five of large displacement, and they would have fifty-one or fifty-two. With comparisons such as these, it was perfectly obvious that we were nearly up to the full limit necessary for our naval strength. He doubted whether it was necessary even now to accelerate our building or to go forward with one or two armoured cruisers now in contemplation. The comparative strength of our Fleet was so great that there was no reason whatever for accelerating building, but important reasons why we should economise on the Construction Vote.

The work of purging the Fleet had, no doubt, been wisely conceived. It required a great deal of courage to, within a few months, get rid of every ship in the list that was not necessary to our security, and a greater amount of courage still, to throw something like 160 of those vessels on the scrap heap. The hon. Gentleman, in speaking of the new policy, would appear to have never heard of the introduction of steam into the Navy. That was, of course, a greater revolution than the redistribution of the Fleet. The truth was that the extravagant language which had been used in connection with the changes in the Fleet was totally unnecessary. There had been a re-sorting of the cards which would, no doubt, result in great economies and add to the efficiency of the Fleet. For his own part, he would give the Government all the support he could in endorsing the policy which had been initiated by Sir John Fisher, but he objected, when they offered criticisms on Admiralty matters, to be waved aside as beneath the considera ion of Gentlemen in office. During the last few years they had offered many suggestions, and it was gratifying to find that many of them had now been accepted.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said he was spared the unpleasant task of having to make a lengthy speech as the result of the speech which had been delivered by his noble friend the Member for Ealing. He agreed with the general trend of that speech, although there were some points in it with which he ventured very respectfully to differ. He strongly supported his noble friend with reference to the local defences of our naval ports. He himself had previously brought the matter before the House; and he hoped his noble friend, if he pursued it, would be strongly supported in his endeavour to obtain a rational policy in regard to our ports which would not only be economical but also efficient. The salient feature of the First Lord's programme was a reduction of £3,500,000. Like his noble friend, a round sum of that kind made him rather suspicious. It was remarkable, further, that in the First Lord's Memorandum the reduction was only put at £3,000,000, whereas in the Estimates it appeared as £3,500,000. The First Lord, in his Memorandum, stated that the Navy was never in a more perfect state of preparedness than at present, and he paid a well-deserved compliment to the late Controller, Admiral May. He desired, however, to protest against the secrecy which was to attach to the proceedings of the Committee of Designs. That was a new departure of which they had been given no explanation or justification. What was the use of talking about secrecy when the very first ship of a type that was built would disclose its design and its object to the world? He regarded it as a shelter-trench in which the Board of Admiralty collectively and individually could take refuge from responsibility or even criticism. Any member of the Board might say, "Do not blame me, I merely carried out the design of the secret Committee." He, therefore, protested against the principle of secrecy as applied to the designs of ships. He did not know whether the Committee was advisory or consultative, or how long it was to be in existence, or whether its decisions were to be the collective opinion of the Committee, or whether individual members were to report on the particular part of the ship regarding which they had expert knowledge. The composition of the Committee was somewhat peculiar; and the only two members on it who appeared to him to be able to adequately deal with the subject were the Director of Naval Construction and the Assistant Constructer. He could not understand why the Controller of the Navy was left off this Committee, while admirals, who were mostly at sea on the other side of the Atlantic, were placed upon it. How was the Committee to meet, and what were to be the relations between the Committee and the Controller, or the Controller and the Committee ?

*MR. PRETYMAN : The Controller of the Navy, Captain Jackson is a member of the Committee.

SIR JOHN COLOMB said the point referred to by the hon. Member had escaped his attention, and consequently he withdrew his remarks on that head. As to dockyard administration he regretted that the element of business experience and knowledge was not better represented upon that Committee. The Committee was to inquire into the organisation and administration of dockyards: Did that include the finance system—the most important part of all ?

While postponing any detailed observations upon construction until the Vote came on, he felt bound to say that he did not regard the construction proposals with unqualified satisfaction. He regretted the postponement of the fourth armoured cruiser, and thought the Admiralty had taken upon themselves a great responsibility by the course they had adopted. He feared that they were drifting far too rapidly towards a by-policy of submarines. Submarines were entirely in an experimental stage, and while nations compelled to contemplate the expensive *role* in maritime war might find it necessary to develop their submarine policy very rapidly, there was no such necessity in our case. But the feature in the new construction to which he most strongly objected related to destroyers, as it disclosed a tendency of a very dangerous kind. The programme was to build a large number of coastal destroyers because they were cheap, and a small number of ocean-going destroyers because they were dear. That was a most dangerous policy. The deciding factor should be national maritime necessity. If they commenced building an inferior type of destroyers because they were cheap it was a very short step to a similar policy in other types; in fact, that passage in the Memorandum gave a possible clue to the idea which had prompted a reduction of £3,500,000.

It had always been the policy to weed out obsolete vessels, and, while possibly in the past they had been over-cautious, he was very much afraid they were now acting rather recklessly. There was an uncertainty about the ships themselves. On the first of the month the Navy List was published showing the obsolete ships that were to be sold, and then, ten days afterwards, Parliament was furnished with a list, but the two lists did not agree. That seemed to show that there had been undue haste in the practical application of the policy of weeding out, tending to produce a sensation. He altogether condemned any attempt on the part of anybody connected with, or representing, the Admiralty to lend themselves to anything of a sensational character. The mobilisation scheme was a tremendous step in the direction of bringing men from sea to serve in harbours and on shore. The distribution of ships at sea was merely a further step in the development which had been in process ever since the establishment of the Channel Squadron. There was nothing remarkable about that, but it was put forward in a sensational way, and soon attracted great attention. But the great point so far as the *personnel* was concerned was that it would keep more officers and men in harbour and on shore than ever before. What was wanted to prepare men for war was constant sea experience, but he calculated that there would be rather less than one-half of the 129,000 officers and men on active service at sea, the remainder being comfortably installed on land, or in harbour on stationary ships. The House could not be too careful in watching that in any effort towards economy the sea experience of officers and men should not be diminished. Was it true that under this new scheme naval officers and men would be for a longer time on shore and in harbour than they would be at sea ?

*MR. PRETYMAN : They will go to sea.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said he was quite aware that they would go to sea, but for how long? He knew that a few of these ships would be mobilised and sent to sea during the manœuvres of 1905, but it was no answer to his argument to say that they would go to sea for some three weeks in the summer occasionally. He thought it was a tremendous step, and a very serious step, under the new scheme to gravitate officers and men more towards life in harbours and on shore rather than at sea. The reason why victory went with our Fleet during the Napoleonic Wars was because our vessels were always at sea, and therefore they should watch carefully any scheme that deprived their officers and men of sea training and experience.

With regard to the grouping of the ships in different fleets, very little could be said as far as the Atlantic was concerned, but when they passed to the Eastern Hemisphere a great deal could be said. He confessed that he was disappointed with the First Lord's Memorandum in sketching out this programme. The China Fleet was really the most important area of the other hemisphere, and they were told in December that this would be more fully dealt with in the Memorandum accompanying these Estimates. That hope, however, had not been realised, because the present Memorandum only gave details of the substitution of one ship for another. In the other hemisphere they had the United States flanking one side and Japan in the northern part of it. Those were the two countries that had made the most extraordinary developments in naval strength in recent years. Although the First Lord of the Admiralty told them of increased mobility, he could not see anything in the Memorandum of December 6th last year or in the Memorandum of to-day dealing with the distribution of the Fleet, showing the scheme to be the result of a world-wide look at the naval position, for it absolutely paid no attention whatever to the British position in the Pacific in the very near future, and he protested against that. Much as he hoped that amity with the United States would long continue, he declined to base the British naval policy upon pious hopes. With every hope for continued amity, they could not ignore the development there, and they must have regard to their own position in the Pacific. Take, for another example, Japan. Did anybody believe that our alliance with Japan was an everlasting covenant. It would be a firm alliance as long as it suited Japan, and as long as both countries had a common interest, but let there be a divergence of interests and that alliance would soon come to end. He asked his hon. friend not to shirk this question of the future of the Pacific. The Pacific formed one-half of the world of water, and British interests in trade and commerce and our hopes and aspirations for the future, were hugely in excess of those of every other nation in the world, and yet they were expected to hold that hemisphere with no primary base. The Power that controlled the Pacific one day, would control the Indian Ocean the next. The new scheme was not a calm review dealing with the whole policy of the Empire in the near future. The policy dealt with one hemisphere under the conditions of to-day, but it took no notice of the developments going on in the world, and the necessity of Britain combining with Australasia and Canada to prepare to hold the Pacific. He asked the House to ponder over the fact that a scheme had been produced apparently to settle the arrangements as to how the British were to command the sea for a long time to come, yet those arrangements ignored the simple elementary facts with regard to the British position in the Pacific, and the developments that were taking place in power of producing locally the instruments of naval warfare in the Pacific. This was, therefore, a small scheme rather of the politician than the statesman. The scheme was admirable as far as it went, because it went a little ahead of what was done before, but it failed as a statesman's scheme. If this Empire of ours was to survive it could only be by securing the assured freedom of the waters of the world, by combining the resources of all parts of its territories scattered over the world to attain that object.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

ADJOURNMENT (UNDER STANDING ORDER No. 10) APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE).

*MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said in moving the adjournment of the House on this subject he should like to make it perfectly clear and plain that this was in no sense of the word a personal attack on the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade. They all liked, respected, and admired the hon. Gentleman, and had he obtained promotion they would have had no objection. The Motion now moved was for the purpose of protesting against the appointment of Lord Salisbury to the highly important office of the President of the Board of Trade. No one would deny that that was a most important office, and everyone hoped that as time went on its importance was destined to increase rather than diminish. The office was instituted in 1786, and its members were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the First Lord of the Treasury, the First Lord of the Admiralty, the principal Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Speaker, certain Privy Councillors, and last, but not least, the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, and ruling over those gentlemen were a president and a vice-president. It was hardly necessary to say that owing to its constitution that Board never met, and by custom and by practice the whole responsibility now rested on the President of the Board of Trade. The duties of the President of the Board of Trade were many and complex. He had to preside over the great railway systems of this country, arteries which were neither more nor less than the living of the great home trade of this country; over our mercantile marine, which, thanks to free trade, was supreme on every sea, and which provided work for 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 of men, and brought to this country £80,000,000 or £90,000,000 annually; he had control over harbours, and over the lighting of our coasts; and he had now to deal with the settlement of labour disputes, and many other matters of a similar nature. Ought not a Minister with all these duties to perform to be a Member of the House of Commons? The House of Commons was composed largely of business men; many of the mercantile princes were in the House, and every Member was from time to time brought into touch with the great mercantile undertakings in their constituencies, and it was their duty to bring the interests of those great undertakings before the President of the Board of Trade. They wished to ask him questions across the floor of the House, and to argue with him on these matters, and they did not want to be told, as they would now be told whenever a difficult and complex matter came before them, that no definite answer could be given because the hon. Gentleman had to consult his noble friend in another place. Of all the unsatisfactory answers given from time to time in the House that was the most unsatisfactory, because they all knew that it led to nothing.

There were two matters in which the House of Commons ought to be considered supreme, one was finance, and the other trade. Members of that House had more personal knowledge of these matters than noble Lords in another place, and had more practice in regard to them. It always seemed to him that the Prime Minister desired to exalt the other place at the expense of that House, when he allowed blocking Motions to stand in the Order Book which prevented this House from discussing questions of interest, though they could be discussed in the other place. Then the Prime Minister had a theory that all great Ministers of State should sit in the House of Lords. He said in the year 1903, when speaking on a somewhat similar Motion—

> "Yet I am convinced that the difficulty of carrying that out will be found increasingly great, and that as you pile one duty after another upon the heads of great Departments, so it will make it less and less possible for a man to be a Member of the House of Commons and a great Minister at the same time."

With this theory and with the new rules of the House of Commons passed by him it was evident that the Prime Minister was quite willing to exalt the Upper House at the expense of the House of Commons. What was the reason of this appointment? He would not discuss Lord Salisbury's qualifications. He knew that Lord Salisbury was a good free-trader; that he was a lieutenant-colonel of Volunteers, and also that he was Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in that House for three years and had lately been Lord Privy Seal, an office somewhat in the nature of a sinecure. The other day, speaking at King's Lynn, Lord Claude Hamilton gave instances of how Governments were formed. He said that he had been asked by Mr. Disraeli to join his Government, but he was subsequently told that he could not be taken in as Lord George Hamilton had displayed more industry; and then Mr. Disraeli went on to say that he could not take in Lord Claude because he could not have more than one member of the same family in a Government. He did not know whether the Prime Minister agreed with that or not. But the real and true reason for this appointment was to be found in the Parliamentary poll-book. The theory of the Prime Minister seemed to be, "Come what may, appoint whom you will, but by all means let us avoid a by-election." During recent times the House had been accustomed to these constant changes in the Government. In the eye of the Prime Minister a week-end reconstruction was almost as popular as the week-end holiday, but the real reason which governed him in making this appointment was to prevent the electorate getting at him under any circumstances. The Prime Minister might be able to quote precedents for the action that he had taken. He might point out that Tory Prime Ministers had appointed Peers to be Presidents of the Board of Trade. Whig Ministers no doubt had done the same thing, but since the time of Mr. Gladstone—from 1868 onward—no President of the Board of Trade appointed by a Liberal Administration had sat in the House of Lords. But he did not wish to rely upon precedents only. They should not be guided by precedent in a case of this kind. The Government themselves admitted that times were changed, and there would have to be some alteration in the Board of Trade. They told the House in the King's Speech that they intended to alter the Board of Trade and establish a Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Everyone thought that meant an improvement in the *status* of the President of the Board of Trade, but the first thing they found after the debate on the Address was over was that the Minister of Commerce was to sit in the House of Lords. It was because he thought this appointment detrimental to the trade and commerce of the country, derogatory to the House of Commons, and injurious to the interests of their constituents, that he moved the adjournment.

*MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said he was glad to support this Motion, not only for the general reasons given by his hon. friend, but because he thought in the first place that the Prime Minister had lost a great opportunity of altering the balance of administrative offices in favour of the House of Commons. This House had predominance in the government of this country, both in the matter of finance and in legislation, but in a case of this kind he thought it did not protest sufficiently against so large a portion of the administrative positions in the country being in the hands of Peers. Of the ten great Ministerial appointments, one third had, during the last few Ministries, been held by Peers. No one would say that a Peer of distinguished ability should be excluded from administrative office. Far from it. But it seemed to him that no Peer who had obscure and mediocre abilities ought to hold distinguished office in the State when there were men of the same calibre to be found in the House of Commons. In the other House there was nothing to test the capacity of a man as to the way he carried on his office. In this House, whatever a man's ability might be, he had to stand the test of constant criticism, and it was easy for the House to form an opinion of his character. This House ought to be very jealous of allowing any great office of State to be held by a Member of the other House, except he be one of the most distinguished Peers of the kingdom. The Department to which this Motion had relation had two sides to it. It had a commercial side and a labour side, and from both the commercial and the labour world there was a demand for a special Minister in their special interests. Ideally, it seemed to be an office which should be represented in this House by both the President and Parliamentary Secretary. One of those Gentlemen should be a commercial man and the other a Labour Member, but the Prime Minister could no more get a Labour Member to fill one of those positions than the hon. Member for West Birmingham could get a Labour Member to occupy a seat on his Tariff Commission. Perhaps Lord Salisbury was appointed because of the difficulty in which the Government found themselves. The present Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade was admirably fitted for the post, but he was a strong protectionist. His late chief was an avowed free-trader, and the Parliamentary Secretary was a strong man. He was almost the only man besides the hon. Member for Sleaford who had the courage to make protectionist speeches in the House, and, no doubt, he required a strong free-trader to balance him. But it would have given more confidence to the House if the right hon. Gentleman had selected the House of Commons representative of the distinguished race to which Lord Salisbury belonged, the Member for Greenwich.

The serious part of the present situation was the way in which the Prime Minister made appointments. His right hon. friend had alluded to what the right hon. Gentleman had said upon the last occasion when this subject was discussed. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say in that speech that never again should we see a Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in this House. That statement was received with some astonishment, but it showed the length to which the views of the right hon. Gentleman tended to carry him. During his Administration he had made many new appointments. Putting aside appointments to Court offices and to the positions of Whip, the right hon. Gentleman had made five new appointments in his Government; he had appointed one commoner, the Colonial Secretary, and four Peers. He had raised from subordinate positions in the Ministry, not counting lateral transferences from one office to another, two Peers and eight commoners, but three of the eight commoners were heirs to great Peerages. He did not say the right hon. Gentleman was wrong to appoint these gentlemen, but, in considering these appointments, the House had to consider the fact that the right hon. Gentleman was not only appointing Peers to Ministerial positions, but that he was also appointing and promoting hon. Gentlemen who, in the course of time, would be in the Upper House. The right hon. Gentleman in the appointments he was making was not having regard to the fair proportion of appointments which this House had a right to claim, and he thought his hon. friend had done well in the interests of this House to call attention to the fact.

Mr. PURVIS (Peterborough) said as long as there were two Houses of Parliament, the judgment of the Cabinet and the sentiment of the political Party which supported the Cabinet must be adequately represented in both Houses. The House of Lords and the House of Commons were independent bodies, and the adequate representation of the Executive Government by Ministers in both Houses secured that uniformity of deliberation which was necessary on great public questions. Every question was presented to both Houses from the same point of view. This Motion claimed for the House of Commons the privilege of having the President of the Board of Trade in this House. Such a privilege had no existence, it was not so many years ago that the Duke of Richmond was President of the Board of Trade. With all due deference to hon. Gentlemen opposite, the House of Lords contained many men qualified to give the very best opinions on trade and commerce. One had only to mention such names as Lord Goschen, whom they all knew, and the late Lord Hardwicke, whom many of them had known, to justify that statement. Lord Salisbury would not, in discussing matters of trade, speak in a back room, as it were, in the House of Lords, and even if they admitted that this prominent Department was not represented in this House except by an official of inferior grade, there was the other side to the question, which was that in the case of the noble Lord there would be no necessity for attending at night at nine o'clock, and he would, therefore, have more time to devote to the questions relating to his office.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): It appears to me that the mover and the seconder, to say nothing of my hon. friend who has just spoken, have perhaps travelled a little wide of the relatively narrow terms in which the Motion for the adjournment has been couched. The mover began by giving a short historical survey of the Board of Trade. He was not afraid to air again that well-known joke or gibe about the constitution of the Board of Trade, that among its members are to be found distinguished dignitaries who have from the nature of their employment nothing to do with trade, such, for example, as the Archbishop of Canterbury and even the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is not, after all, the constitution of the Board of Trade which is in question. We are not going to discuss whether the Board of Trade should have at its head an official corresponding in *status* to a Secretary of State or whether the ancient and dignified fiction of the Board should be longer maintained. On that point there is much to be said *pro* and *con*, but really it is quite irrelevant to our debate to-night, and I do not know how the hon. Gentleman who initiated the discussion thought fit to deal with it. The real question we have before us, I imagine, is whether or not the President of the Board of Trade for the time being should necessarily be in this House or whether he may be occasionally or often in another place. I do not think that in dealing with the subject hon. Members have sufficiently considered the problem which must always be dealt with by any Minister on whom falls the duty of advising the Sovereign on the constitution of the Government for the time being. I understand, however, that this duty will soon fall upon themselves, and I do not think that they will find it to be an easy one—at any rate, not easier than their predecessors have found it. I would seriously say in the best interests of the country, wholly irrespective of Party, that it is eminently desirable as few difficulties should be thrown in the way of the Prime Minister of the day as, in conformity with other overmastering interests, it is possible to arrange.

The mover of the Motion indicated that the one solitary consideration which influenced the present Prime Minister was the desire to avoid by-elections. Supposing that were true—it is not true—but supposing it were true, can there be a severer condemnation of our existing system? I remember in my early days the Party to which I belong [OPPOSITION cries of "Which Party?"]—it was in 1780; I should have said 1880—derived infinite enjoyment from the satisfaction of turning the late Sir William Harcourt out of his seat at Oxford on his taking office as Home Secretary. He found a seat elsewhere, but his absence from the House was a temporary inconvenience to Mr. Gladstone's Government; and, in my opinion, although it gave us great satisfaction as a good practical joke, it was a severe condemnation of the system on which we now carry on business. There is no practical Assembly in the world but our own which would tolerate such a system for an instant. I am not going into that question, on which I feel very strongly and on which some day I hope to have the pleasure or the pain to trouble the House with a longer speech. I only mention it because the hon. Member chose to throw across the floor of the House a taunt of which I do not complain, and I do not think was directed against me, but against the system which I desire to see destroyed, not in my interest or in the interest of this side of the House, but in the interest of both sides of the House and of sound government, and the interest which, after all, must be of the greatest importance to the whole community—the free choice of those persons best qualified to fill particular offices.

The seconder of the Motion laid down the proposition that in dividing the offices between the two Houses no account should be taken of the fact that there were two Houses of Parliament—in other words, for the purpose of distributing office you had to consider the individual himself without considering whether he belonged to one House or the other, or the equitable and fair division between the two historic branches of the Legislature. That has never been the principle on which any Prime Minister up to the present time has acted. The hon. Member knows perfectly well that every Prime Minister, to whichever Party he belonged, has always considered that the House of Lords had a claim as an equal branch of the Legislature with ourselves to a proportion—not necessarily an exact equivalent proportion—of the great offices of State. I do not know whether that is going to be, with other constitutional maxims, abandoned by hon. Members opposite. Some of them desire to "mend or end" the House of Lords; and this may be, indeed, the beginning of that campaign with which they threaten us against that Assembly. But so long as the House of Lords exists, occupying as it does an essential and an historic place in our constitutional system, so long will it be a grave dereliction of duty on the part of any Minister who has to advise the Crown in the formation of a Government to ignore the claims of the House of Lords to a portion of the great administrative offices of the State. I had to make important changes in the Government owing to the resignation of the late Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, and the resignation also of Lord Onslow. Have I altered the balance of Cabinet Ministers between us and House of Lords? I have retained it exactly where it was. That the changes had to be made no one regrets more than I do; but as the changes had to be made, I do not believe that the necessity could have been better met than as I have endeavoured to meet it.

The seconder of the Motion has chosen to mix up two different questions in his attack on the Government. He was not content with endeavouring to show that I had displayed undue partiality to the House of Lords in giving to that Assembly the Presidency of the Board of Trade, but he set himself to prove that I had a peculiar partiality for those who either were, or in the course of nature would become, Peers of the realm. Supposing that somewhat absurd accusation were true, what would it have to do with this Motion, if I may say so without offence? Because my noble friend the Postmaster-General is the heir to a Peerage, what has it to do with the fact that Lord Salisbury has been appointed President of the Board of Trade? It has not the remotest connection. But I suppose that the hon. Member desired to raise a prejudice, to make something in the nature of a personal attack, because I think too well of his sense of relevance and logic to suppose that he would have dragged in such irrelevant matter if he had not had the motive which I suggest. A good deal has been said about a speech which I delivered in the House some years ago—I forget what speech it was.

Mr. SOARES: It was in 1903, when Lord Onslow was appointed Minister for Agriculture.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I had forgotten that. Did the hon. Gentleman and his friends object to it because Lord Onslow was a Peer? [Cries of "Yes."] Then their last shred of argument is gone. They are of opinion not only that the Board of Trade but the Board of Agriculture should be in this House, and they think that the necessity is equal. I do not think they ought to be in this House, but I admit that the necessity is equal, and therefore I have transferred the Board of Agriculture from the other House and put the Board of Trade there. That should be a fair arrangement even according to the views of hon. Members. I am greatly indebted to the hon. Gentleman for having reminded me of a Parliamentary episode which had escaped my recollection. He reminded me of a speech I made on the occasion of Lord Onslow's appointment. Though I had forgotten that speech, I recognise that the sentiments contained in the extract are those which I entertained and still entertain. The hon. Member reminded the House that I had stated that the growing labours both of administrative and of Parliamentary life are such that the difficulty of holding a very heavy office in this House is day by day an increasing difficulty. Those two hon. Gentlemen who have not held important administrative offices seem to regard it as an absurd paradox and as a wanton attack on the privileges of this House. Really it is not a paradox, and it is not an attack on this House. The tendency of events, and the natural course and development of an Assembly such as this, throws upon the Ministers of the day and upon the non-official Members of the day an ever-increasing burden of work and sacrifice. Compare the hours and the strain put upon Members when I first entered the House more than a generation ago, or the generation before that, and you will find that the one uninterrupted tendency, whoever was in power, whatever the questions occupying the attention of the country or the state of our foreign relations, has been more and more to make the labours of individual Members, and not less the labours of Ministers, in the House of Commons become greater and greater. And while that is going on within these walls there is a similar tendency going on with regard to all the great offices of State. A century or a century and a half ago what had a Minister to do? What was the administrative work thrown upon him? It was practically, as we should say in these days, nothing. Now, year by year, the closer intercourse of nations, the development of means of communication, the growing policy of this House and the other House, but chiefly of this House, to throw more and more labours upon Departments—these are all tending to make separate administrative offices more and more absorbing in the continuous labour which they impose upon their occupants. I am not talking of duties which fall upon me, which are of a somewhat special kind; but take the very office of the Board of Trade we are considering. The hon. Gentleman, in his speech, said that every year the House of Commons throws new duties on the President of the Board of Trade. So it does; and, therefore, every year the House of Commons makes it more difficult for the head of that particular office also to carry on the great labours incident to a Member of this House. And as for the Minister for Foreign Affairs, I repeat what has been regarded as a paradox by the seconder of the Motion. I say you will not again see in this House a Foreign Minister unless you are prepared deliberately to release that Minister from the ordinary obligations of a Member of the House. Because if you ask him to come down at two o'clock or a quarter past to answer Questions or when his own office is under discussion; if you require him to be down, as my right hon. friends are required to come down, whenever there is a Government division or an important Government debate; if you require him to be here throughout the whole afternoon, to come again, if need be, at nine, and at the same time to carry on the work of such an office as the Foreign Office, you cannot do it. I respectfully say it with full knowledge both of what the House of Commons requires and what is required of the Minister for Foreign Affairs. The strain in any case is great, and I say that to add to the labours which are thrown on the Minister for Foreign Affairs the labours of the day-to-day work of this House is really out of the question. In truth, much as we may dislike it, we have to recognise that our ambitions as legislators do conflict with those other natural ambitions to have the heads of the administrative Departments in this House. I believe that in the interests of administration as well as in other interests the immemorial constitutional practice ought to be maintained—that of keeping in the other House a certain number of the great Departments of State and not necessarily those which entail least labour upon their occupants.

Beyond a few covert sneers, nothing has been said against Lord Salisbury's capacity for the office; and I am sure hon. Gentlemen are anxious to say nothing of a personal character and nothing that could legitimately hurt the feelings of anybody, certainly not of the noble Lord himself. But the hon. Members did imply that what they called a business training was, or ought to be, an invariable accompaniment of anybody holding the office of President of the Board of Trade. [Cheers.] I really do not think those enthusiastic cheers will be repeated when I recall the fact that the last occupant of the office on their own side was a very distinguished gentleman whose great services to mankind were chiefly connected with history and scientific law—much more important qualifications, I think, than those of a mere business training. Nor do I think that anything should be sacrificed in order to obtain purely business qualifications. Get them if you can, but sacrifice nothing in the way of general ability in order to gain them. That is the constitutional practice, and I believe it is a perfectly sound one. It was Lord Beaconsfield, I think, who said that a business man was a man who has left business, or whom business has left; and it is certainly true that to neglect the greater qualities in order to obtain technical ability in some particular branch of business would be a very evil practice, and one which would be little calculated to advance the general business interests of the country represented by the Board of Trade. May I just read out a short list of the Presidents of the Board of Trade for the last half century? Lord Stanley of Alderley, the right hon. Joseph Henley, Lord Donoughmore, the right hon. Thomas Milner Gibson, Sir S. Northcote, the Duke of Richmond, the right hon. John Bright, the right hon. Chichester Fortescue, Sir Charles Adderley, Lord Sandon, the right hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the right hon. E. Stanhope, the right hon. Anthony Mundella, Lord Stanley of Preston, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, the right hon. James Bryce, the right hon. C. T. Ritchie, and the right hon. G. W. Balfour. That is the list of fifty years, and those are the choices made by successive Prime Ministers during that time, drawn from both Parties; and I venture to say that in that list there is conclusive proof of two things—first, that Prime Ministers have not shrunk from putting the President of the Board of Trade in the House of Lords, and, in the second place, that they took no special pains to search out men of business training in order to fill the office of President of the Board of Trade. As for the general capacity of the new holder of the office, I admit the full responsibility which I have undertaken in recommending his name to the King, and I imagine we shall not debate that point, because it is undebateable with advantage or even with propriety, across the floor of the House. But on the particular points that I have not increased the number of Cabinet offices in the House of Lords, that I—I am sorry to have to use the first personal pronoun, but it is my advice, after all—have not violated tradition by putting a Peer in the position of President of the Board of Trade—those two things, I think, are perfectly clear, and I do not think there is the smallest justification for the Motion which has been proposed and seconded this evening.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said his hon. friends who moved and seconded the Motion for the adjournment refrained very carefully from making any personal attack upon Lord Salisbury, and the Prime Minister had reciprocated that courtesy by criticising the qualifications of the Liberal President of the Board of Trade ten years ago.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I specially said that I thought the right hon. Gentleman had much greater claims to our consideration than could be derived from a business training.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he accepted the explanation. He had probably misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman. The Prime Minister had skilfully tried to divert this into an attack on the House of Lords, but the Motion had nothing to do with the particular view held by Members on either side about the House of Lords. The question was whether the President of the Board of Trade ought to be in the other House or in this House. That was a totally different proposition. The Prime Minister said he had considered the relative claims of the two Houses, and had distributed the offices in such a way as to give the House of Lords fair representation. He pointed out that Lord Onslow, who was Minister of Agriculture, was in the House of Lords, and that now the Minister of Agriculture was in the House of Commons. But the right hon. Gentleman did not point out, first, that the predecessor of Lord Onslow as Minister of Agriculture, the late Mr. Hanbury, was in this House; and, secondly, that when Lord Onslow was appointed all the chambers of agriculture throughout the country memorialised the Government that the Minister of Agriculture should be in the House of Commons. The appointment of a Member of this House as Minister of Agriculture was the result of the unanimous request of the agricultural societies of the country. If that was the case in regard to agriculture, surely the case in regard to the Board of Trade was overwhelming. If ever there was a chief who ought to be in the House of Commons it was the chief of the Board of Trade. The Board of Trade had to deal with commerce, trade, and industry. How many representatives of the working classes were there in the House of Lords? The representatives of the commercial interests—the shipping interest, for instance—weret o be found in the House of Commons. The hon. Member for Peterborough said there were many Members in the House of Lords who knew a great deal about trade and commerce. That was perfectly true, but how was it that they were not appointed? The great majority of the representatives of the commerce of the country were to be found in the House of Commons, and it was important that the Minister of the Department concerned with trade should be in contact with those representatives day by day. Although there were three or four Peers on the list of those who had represented the Board of Trade, they were only there for a year or, at most, eighteen months at a time; and when the Prime Minister gave his list he did not mention the fact that for forty-five years out of the total of fifty the President of the Board of Trade was in the House of Commons, That showed that not merely Liberal but Conservative Administrations had alike recognised that the head of the Board of Trade ought to be in the House of Commons.

Did not the Committee which was appointed to consider the re-arrangement of offices report that they were satisfied that the work of the Board of Trade had greatly increased in importance in late years, as new duties and responsibilities had been imposed on it by legislation in connection with railways, trade disputes, etc? The Report went on exalting the importance of the office, and it all ended in the appointment of a Peer, who had had no training at all in these matters, to the headship of the Department. He did not say that if a Peer was pre-eminently fitted for the office he should not be appointed. He was making no attack upon Lord Salisbury, and if the noble Lord stood alone—if it was felt in both Houses of Parliament that he was the best man to represent trade in Parliament—he did not mean to say that there would not have been a good deal to say for the position of the Government in appointing him. But that was not the case. He did not wish to draw invidious comparisons, but could it be fairly said that the new representative of the trade and commerce of the country was a man better fitted for the post than his subordinate, the hon. Gentleman who, according to the hon. Member for Peterborough, held an office of an inferior grade. Had it been left to be decided by any one in this House who should be the new head of the Department, would it not have been the hon. Gentleman who now sat in this House?

After all, the Prime Minister's defence was contained in the first part of his speech. What was it? The only defence was the unpopularity of his Government; that practically he could not face by-elections. The Prime Minister was not free to consider the material of his own Party; he could not consider who was the best man for a post; he had to consider the man whose seat was safe. That was not fair to the country. The Prime Minister knew perfectly well he had not a free hand to consider who was the man in his Party who was best fitted to hold this position. After all, it was a very important post, a most important post, perhaps one of the most important in the Ministry. We were attacked in our trade, and this was the way the Government were going to defend it—by supporting the previous Question and appointing the Marquess of Salisbury! For the last two or three years we had heard that our trade was going, that it was being attacked by foreign countries. The Ministerial Party had got their remedy; they, on the Opposition side, had got their remedy—on that they were all agreed. [Hon. Members on the Ministerial Benches: What is your remedy?]

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): A general election.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that their remedy was free trade. He could not discuss that at present; but, at any rate, that was his proposition. They were all agreed that trade was a very important matter from the point of view of the administration of the government of this country; but at this particular moment, when they were all agreed on that, the Government instead of selecting the best man for President of the Board of Trade had regard only to electioneering considerations. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh!"] Why should they make any pretence about it in this House?

Did the House of Commons wish to take its facts, if he might say so, like its fresh air, through cotton wool? Everybody knew why this appointment had been made. The Prime Minister himself did not really deny it. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] Well, he did so in a very half-hearted way; he did not seem to have any settled convictions about it. The Prime Minister was fighting a rear-guard action; everybody knew that he was fighting it with very great skill; but he had loitered too long in a bad position. His own Party were entitled to require that he should put his best man in command, and Grand Dukes were not always the best men; they should not be always of the blood. The Prime Minister knew perfectly well, at any rate, why the thing had been done. His hon. friend had alluded to a former connection of the Archbishop of Canterbury with the Department—he did not know whether tradition required the association of anyone with an ecclesiastical turn of mind with the office. The Prime Minister said that it was of importance to have heads of Departments in the House of Lords. That was a most dangerous attack on the House of Commons, for the whole argument of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to be that Ministers should be in the other House, members of his Party in the House of Commons being so much engaged in coming down to talk against time, between nine and ten o'clock, in order to keep an unpopular Ministry in power. [AN HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Benches: No, no!] Was that really denied? [AN HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Benches: Yes.] Well, he saw that there was one hon. Member who was not going to stand again.

What would the result be of having the representative of this great Department in the House of Lords? After all, the head of the Department was the only one who could answer finally any difficult and complicated question. He remembered when Lord Salisbury was in the House of Commons he was Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, but he was not allowed to answer supplementary Questions. Why? Because his chief was in the House of Lords. Were they going to allow him to answer supplementary Questions in the House of Lords? And who was to be the chief? Was it to be the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, or was it to be the Marquess of Salisbury? There was no Department in the Government which required to be more constantly interrogated than the Board of Trade on questions of shipping, commerce, and labour, and, above all, on questions of sugar. He wished to point out the importance of having in the House of Commons a strong man who knew something, of his own knowledge, of trade, and had an independent judgment of his own. What better proof could they have of that than the stupid blunder of the Sugar Convention? But there was a much bigger question than that looming—that of free trade. He did not believe there was anyone in that House who in his heart would defend this appointment. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Yes."] He ventured to ask if any hon. Member opposite would get up and say that, in his judgment, the Marquess of Salisbury, out of the 200 odd gentlemen who represented the Government in that House, and the 400 odd gentlemen who represented it in the House of Lords, was the best qualified man to be at the head of the trade and commerce and industry of this country? They knew perfectly well that he was nothing of the sort. He supported the Motion for the adjournment in order to object to this sort of recasting of the family settlement.

*MR. MARKS (Kent, Thanet) said that no one outside that House and Party politics would deny that in the matter of the appointment of a high official the main question to be considered was the capability of the man to be appointed. The mover of the Motion for the adjournment had refrained from entering into the question of the Marquess of Salisbury's qualifications, and prided himself on the fact; and without considering these qualifications the hon. Member came to the conclusion that this appointment would be detrimental to the trade of the country. A very serious matter, if true; but the hon. Member had made no attempt to justify his statement. The hon. Member for Carnarvon had asked who was there in the House of Lords who represented the working classes. That was an astounding inquiry to come from a Liberal leader. The Liberal Peers in the House of Lords represented the working classes, and there or elsewhere would work with the hon. Member if and when a Liberal Government came into office. The hon. Member had asked where were the representatives of commerce in the House of Lords; he had asserted that they were to be found only in the House of Commons. He, however, contended that the representatives of commerce who had been most successful were to be found, not in that House, but in the House of Lords; and those who had been only moderately successful sat in this House in the hope that before long they would go to the House of Lords. They were told that the President of the Board of Trade was the head of the trade and commerce of the country. He was nothing of the kind, and was never intended to be. He was meant to direct matters in connection with the trade, commerce, and industry of the country, but he was also responsible for other matters. Prominent amongst those other matters which the President of the Board of Trade had to deal with was the erosion of our sea coasts; a subject which required very serious consideration, and which was more likely to receive that consideration at the hands of a President whose whole time was not taken up with routine work in this House.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): And the amendment of the Company Laws.

*Mr. MARKS: Yes, the amendment of the Company Laws; and, in addition to that, the question of the manning of the merchant marine, with which a Departmental Committee had lately been dealing. One could not help believing that questions of such magnitude and urgency would be better dealt with by a President of the Board of Trade who had more leisure than a Minister who was subjected to the constant harrassing and labour of the House of Commons. It was a very well-known fact that for years past the proportion of foreigners engaged in the mercantile marine——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must have got the wrong speech in his hand.

*Mr. MARKS said that in his inexperience he had thought that any speech which dealt with matters of trade would have been germane to the discussion on the Board of Trade. He would conclude, however, by saying that no argument had been adduced against this appointment. The speeches which had been delivered from the Opposition side of the House had been merely campaign speeches directed against the general policy of the Government.

Mr. BELL (Derby) said he desired to add a few words, as a representative of the working classes. He had listened with great attention to the speeches of the hon. Members who had supported the Prime Minister, but had not heard a single word in justification of this appointment. The President of the Board of Trade, as well as many other heads of Departments, should sit in that House. He was the head of a Department which dealt not only with commerce, but with the interests of the working classes, and he failed to understand why such an appointment should be made in a House where the Minister would be far away from criticism. If the Government did not choose to place within the Cabinet or in the Department dealing with the industry of the country some representative of the labouring class, the least they could do was to place the head of the Department in the House of Commons, where he could be thoroughly questioned. Nothing would give the working classes of the country less confidence in the Government than placing the head of the Board of Trade in the other place.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 167; Noes, 239. (Division List No. 43.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hon. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.

Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward

Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P.C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmond, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfred (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt Hon. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J.A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C.R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters (N. Dorset
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Soares and Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H.F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, J.H.M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J.A. (Worc.

Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hon.Sir JohnC.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar,Sir T R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon SirWilliam Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn.Sir J.(Manc’r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B.(Inv’rn’ssB’ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzgerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick,S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T’rH’mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D (Shrewsbury.
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,RtHnLordG (Midd’x
Hamilton,Marq.of(L’nd’nderry
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem’th
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Sir James (Staffords,NW
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,SirA.(Stafford,W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Hozier,Hon James Henry,Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law,Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm’th
Lawson,Hn H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lawson,John Grant(Yorks.NR
Lee,ArthurH (Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col Charles W.(Evesham
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowstoft)
Lucas,Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,Rt.Hn SirH.E.(Wigt’n
Maxwell,W J.H(Dumfriesshire
Milner,Rt.Hon.SirFrederick G.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon. J.Scott(Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan,DavidJ (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS (Limehouse
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt Hon.Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt Hn.J.G.(Oxf’dUniv.
Taylor, Austen (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent,Col Sir C.EH (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow
Wilson, J W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E R.(Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

SUPPLY [1st Allotted Day.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 129,000 officers, seamen, and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, including 20,211 Royal Marines."

*Mr. PRETYMAN said it was desirable that Vote A and also Vote 1 should be passed to-night. He would endeavour to answer as briefly as possible some of the points which had been raised in the discussion. The question of sea time had been very carefully calculated; and the result of the present system would be that there would be two years active service for officers and men in full commission, and from fourteen to sixteen months in harbour. It might be necessary to work ships in time of war with reduced crews; and the nucleus crews which had been formed would under this scheme obtain very valuable experience. With reference to the question of the secrecy of designs, he did not think he had anything to add to what he had said before. When a ship was completed or partially completed the design was, of course, known; but it was quite another matter to allow the particulars of a design to transpire while the ship was on the stocks, even though it was inevitable that the design would be public property later on. His hon. and gallant friend raised the question as to the two classes of destroyers, one for ocean work and the other for work in narrow waters. It was not true to say that the new twenty-five-and-a-half "knotters" had proved inferior to the old thirty "knotters." In anything like dirty weather the twenty-five-and-a-half "knotters" had shown their superiority. As he had stated to the Committee, they had failed to produce a better design which would combine greater speed with greater stability at a limited cost. After all, cost was a convenient standard and index. The evolution of these two classes was the result of the old battle of opposing factors—navigability and invisibility. It was not true to say that they had abandoned the policy of reducing the size of the destroyers; but they could not get in one class maximum speed and maximum invisibility both in narrow waters and in the open. Therefore, instead of trying to build one class of destroyer, which would attain a maximum speed in all waters, they had designed two classes, each of which advanced to some extent, separately, as regarded speed and invisibility, so as severally to meet requirements in narrow waters and in the open sea.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked if the present destroyers were useless.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said certainly not. Far from being useless they were as good to-day as any destroyers that could be pitted against them.

*Sir JOHN COLOMB said one of the reasons given for the building of these wastal destroyers was that they were cheap.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that, as he had already explained, cost was an important factor; but other considerations had also to be taken into account. As regarded the point raised by his noble friend the Member for Ealing as to taking over the defence of naval bases by the Navy, that was a point of great difficulty, and involved a very large question of policy. It was desirable that the defence of naval bases should be, as far as possible, in one hand, and under one control; but there ust be a dividing line somewhere, and he could think of no more convenient dividing line than the natural dividing line between the Army and Navy —land and sea.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said his suggestion was that the duty discharged by the Army in connection with naval bases should be transferred to the Navy.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that the Navy had already a very considerable area to administer; and the defence of naval bases would be a very large additional commitment. He hoped that, as the Vote had been fully discussed, the Committee would now allow it to be taken.

MR. BUCHANAN said he was somewhat surprised at the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman. So far from suffering from superabundance of information he thought the Committee had some reason to complain that more information had not been given. The hon. Gentleman seemed to be somewhat chary of given information. There was a fundamental difference of opinion between the hon. Gentleman and hon. Members on his side as to the position in which the hon. Gentleman, as the representative of a great spending Department, should stand before the House of Commons. At this most important stage in the history of the Navy, when Estimates were brought forward which marked a new departure in naval policy and finance, the Committee was entitled to receive a full statement from the Minister with regard to that policy. He was surprised that the hon. Gentleman did not make a fuller and more complete statement with regard to the finance of the new system. The hon. Gentleman stated that the redistribution of the Navy was a matter which it was hardly proper for the House of Commons to discuss. He took exception to that. What was the House of Commons for, if not to discuss fully all that concerned the policy and finance of the Navy? What was the use of devoting several paragraphs in the First Lord's Statement to the redistribution of the Navy if the representative of the Navy in this House said it was not a proper subject for discussion? Of course, it would be absurd for him to suggest that there should be eight battleships in the Mediterranean instead of ten, but that was not the question they desired to discuss. It was the general cause which prompted the Government to alter the main lines of the distribution of the Navy, and regarding that no information had been given. His view was that the hon. Gentleman, particularly when he had to bring forward a scheme marking a new departure in policy, ought to take the House of Commons and the country fully and frankly into his confidence. That was not only fair to the House of Commons, but it was best and wisest for himself. A few days ago when a demand was made that the Secretary to the Admiralty should make his statement in Committee instead of with Mr. Speaker in the Chair, the Prime Minister asked what was the good of discussing the policy of the Naval Estimates before they had heard the representative of the Government in charge of them. There seemed, at the time, to be much force in the argument, but, as a matter of fact, so far from making a full statement of the policy of the Admiralty, the hon. Gentleman gave very little information at all, though his statement had been to a certain extent supplemented in response to the interrogatories of the hon. Member for Dundee and others.

The present Navy Estimates were important for two reasons—first, as marking a new naval policy, and, secondly, as indicating a new financial policy with regard to naval affairs. Personally, he cordially welcomed the reduction in the Naval Votes, having always striven, to the best of his ability, to place some curb upon the constant advance in naval and military expenditure, but he would like to be satisfied that it was a real reduction, based upon policy, which would entail further or consequential reductions in years to come. He submitted that the Committee had a right to expect further details with regard to the new policy, especially as much would be heard in the country of its merits and the reductions it had resulted in. A lead had already been given on the subject by the Prime Minister in his rather foolish speech at Glasgow a couple of months ago, and hon. Gentlemen opposite would, doubtless, gladly follow in the same direction. A full defence should be given in the House of Commons, where statements could be criticised, questions asked, and foundations carefully examined. The Secretary to the Admiralty declared the policy to rest upon three foundations—the new distribution of the Fleet, the elimination of out-of-date ships, and the organisation of new bases.

*MR. PRETYMAN: I said the organisation of nucleus crews.

*MR. BUCHANAN said he was quoting from *The Times*.

MR. PRETYMAN: Then I was misreported.

MR. BUCHANAN said that might be so, but he would certainly desire to say a word about the reorganisation of naval bases. He would found his observations not upon the speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty, but upon the Statement of the First Lord, who called attention to the reorganisation of existing naval bases as an important reform. First, with regard to the distribution of the Fleet. A full statement ought to be made of the grounds upon which the large and far-reaching alterations had been made. In his Memorandum of December last, the First Lord stated that he could not then say what was to be done with the China Squadron. But there was no mention of the China Squadron in the new Statement, nor had the hon. Gentleman given any satisfactory explanation. As to the elimination of out-of-date ships, he was at a loss where to begin. Confusion had been worse confounded with regard to the ships that were being weeded out and the ships that were being retained. The Memorandum of the First Lord, in which was enunciated the policy of removing a number of ships from the active list, was dated December 6th. The Prime Minister's speech containing the remark about "the courageous stroke of the pen" was delivered about the middle of January. Surely, then, it would have been possible and only right and courteous to have placed the House of Commons, in the middle of March or before the Navy Estimates were introduced, in possession of full information with regard to the ships that were being struck off the effective list. So far as the Admiralty were concerned they had given no information at all voluntarily. From the Papers issued in response to the demands of the hon. Member for Dundee it was difficult to make out what the action of the Government was in the matter. There was a list of vessels being struck off the effective list, and there was also a list of cruisers not being struck off; but would the Committee believe that there were actually sixteen vessels which appeared in both lists? What did that mean?

*MR. PRETYMAN said it all arose out of the use of the word "effective." By the order of the House of Commons a Return had been prepared of effective and non-effective ships, but those terms no longer definitely covered the new classification of ships. He therefore communicated privately with the hon. Member for Dundee asking in what form he would like the Return prepared. The ships in Part I. were all combatant ships, and therefore those in 1*b*, "Ships of comparatively small fighting value," appeared as combatant ships in the effective Return referred to by the hon. Member, while at the express desire of the hon. Member for Dundee they were included in the Return originally moved for of non-effective ships.

MR. BUCHANAN said there was a further difficulty. The Return referred to "the classification of ships affected by the redistribution of the Fleet since October last as will be shown in Appendix B of the Dockyard Expense Accounts Blue-book, 1903–1904." But that Blue-book was not yet issued. He would not have complained of that if the classification in this Return corresponded in any degree with the classification in previous Dockyard Expense Accounts Blue-books, but it did not. Appendix B was entirely altered in form. He submitted that that was not at all a fair and straightforward way of treating the House of Commons.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that all this difficulty had arisen from his great anxiety to give hon. Members the information they had asked for. At their request he had given the information in the form asked for, but rather piecemeal. If he had refused to give the information until he could supply it in its final form there would have been none of these complaints.

MR. BUCHANAN said the hon. Gentleman knew that this most cardinal point in the new naval policy was mentioned in the First Lord's Statement of December last, and he would have better shown his anxiety to meet the reasonable demands of the House of Commons for information if, when the Estimates were produced, and not afterwards under pressure, he had supplied the information in a complete and intelligible form. The reason given by the First Lord for the removal of many of these ships from the effective list was not that they were out of date, but that they were of such a character as to be a source of weakness and a cause of anxiety to British Admirals, and that they might bring discredit on the British Navy. But which of the ships were really to be considered as coming within that category? As a result of the information given and the Answers supplied, the Committee were completely in the dark as to what vessels were really considered to be obsolete and fit only to be sold. What really was the policy of the Government with regard to the ships they were removing from the effective list? Information had been given as to the amount recently spent on repairs on the ships included in one or other of the lists. In 1903–4 £51,000 and £48,000 were spent on the "Medea" and the "Medusa" respectively. But in the present year there were the following amounts put down for repairs of vessels struck off the effective list: the "Sans Pareil," £12,300; the "Collingwood," £20,858; the "Naiad," £33,578; the "Philomel," £22,538; the "Barracouta"—which was to be sold—£28,066. Other vessels were down for smaller sums, and the total amounted to between £140,000 and £150,000. Surely that showed a great want of foresight on the part of the Admiralty during recent years. In the face of these hard facts and figures the confidence of the country in the wisdom of the Admiralty would be sorely shaken. Then, taking these lists in their widest form, there were still left upon the active list eighty or a hundred vessels of the same character attached to squadrons throughout the world. What were the Government going to do with those vessels? Was this only the beginning of a policy, or was it a policy complete in itself? Was it the policy of the Admiralty that in future the British Fleet should consist of battleships, armoured cruisers, scouts, torpedo destroyers, submarines, and vessels of that character, and that eventually protected and semi-protected cruisers should disappear altogether?

Then with regard to the bases. The hon. Gentleman had said that he did not mention them in his introductory statement. But the First Lord had called attention to the subject. Why did not the Admiralty make a clean breast of the matter? It was a new departure; why not tell the House of Commons all about it? He was inclined to think the policy a wise one, but more information was necessary. As he understood the statement, Halifax, Esquimault, Jamaica, and Trincomalee were to cease to be naval bases at all. Why could they not be told what was being done in regard to Bermuda? Apparently there was going to be a large alteration in the position Bermuda held as a naval base. The *personnel* there had been largely reduced, and the expenditure had been reduced from £12,000 to £5,000. They had also had a statement from the Secretary of State for War that the garrison at Bermuda was to be reduced by one-half. The statement of the Secretary of State for War made it quite clear what was going to be done, and why could they not have a similar statement from the Secretary to the Admiralty? In the past they had been spending money out of the Naval Works Loans hand over hand upon Bermuda. A Return had been issued by the Secretary to the Treasury showing that £609,000 had been spent upon works at Bermuda, £380,000 out of Naval Works Loans, and £229,000 out of money voted for works for the Navy. Until the present year they had been yearly increasing expenditure upon permanent works, and now there had been a sudden change of policy and the works were being stopped. How could the House of Commons and the public have any confidence in the foresight of the Admiralty when they pursued a policy of this kind? Whenever they saw a new departure on the part of a public Department from the practice of previous years, he urged hon. Members to immediately take notice of it, because the following year it might be quoted as a precedent. In previous years the Admiralty had always given them a summary of the cost of works both under the Votes and under the Loans Acts, and they had always taken good care to note the important ones. It was extraordinary that the appendix to the First Lord's Statement, in dealing with the expenditure under the Naval Works Act, omitted all mention of the works at Bermuda, Chatham, and Rosyth. Explanation had been asked for again and again, and had been refused. This was behaving discourteously to the House of Commons, and if there had been a change in the policy of the Admiralty all along the line why were they not told whether there had been any change in this respect. The Chatham extension and the Rosyth dockyard were put into the Loans Bill of 1903, but the Admiralty would not give them the figures. He agreed that it was a wise policy to curtail this expenditure from loans, but he thought they ought to be supplied with more information. The only item of expenditure for Rosyth which they were told about was £112 paid to the local authorities for supplying water to a community which, up to the present, had no actual existence. He hoped that fact would not escape the attention of hon. Members when they came to go more closely into these Estimates.

But did the proposals now put before them mean a real reduction? He was bound to say that owing to the lack of proper information it was very difficult to form a conclusion. They had not yet got from the Government a complete statement of the naval expenditure for the year. Hon. Members were aware that besides the Navy Estimates there was a vast amount of expenditure under the Naval Loans Acts, and the House should insist upon getting from the Government a complete estimate of the amount of money they intended to spend out of loans for the current year. Was there any reason why the progressive increase of expenditure upon loans should not cease? Owing to the existence of these Loans Acts the Admiralty were tempted to transfer expenditure from works to loans. Under the Navy Appropriation Acts year after year the Comptroller and Auditor-General made a note of expenditure which was taken from the Votes and placed upon the Loans Fund. There was one instance of a charge for buying a church and parsonage house at Portsmouth for which money was asked for in 1903–4, and without the knowledge of the House that money had been taken off the Votes and placed to the Loans Account to be paid for in thirty years. Was that right and fair? Did actions like that inspire them with confidence in the Estimates? In face of facts like these it was impossible for them to know whether this was a real reduction or not until they got fuller information. They had got very little information upon the question of repairs. The decrease was about £500,000, but £300,000 of that was due to the Admiralty method of doing the repairs in their own dockyards. He wished to know were they likely to have the repairs done more cheaply in the future over the whole Fleet generally when they would have to be done at Gibraltar and Malta? Would the repairs done at those places be cheaper than if they were done at the home ports? To his mind the evidence was all the other way. They would have to send out the men and stores there.

*Mr. PRETYMAN: But the labour will be cheaper.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that would constitute only a flea-bite in the expenditure. There was another fundamental question to which up to the present he had not been able to get an answer. A large number of ships were to be removed from the effective list, and at the present time they were in commission with full crews. Those vessels were to be removed and placed in charge of caretakers. What would become of those crews? If this scheme was to be consistent, ought they not also to have a real proposal for a reduction of the men? Seeing that there was a large reduction in the number of ships, surely there ought to be, as a logical consequence, a reduction in the *personnel* under Vote A. There appeared to be no such reduction; and for that and other reasons he submitted that the scheme presented by the Admiralty was not a properly thought-out scheme to bring back naval expenditure to the reasonable figure of former years. He could not help thinking that the scheme put before them was merely a tentative one for this year only, and put together in view of an early dissolution of Parliament.

Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) thought the debate had proved useful in making clearer the case of the ships struck off the Navy List. He instanced the "Melpomene," which had been represented in a naval journal as a nineteen-knot cruiser. As a matter of fact, it was on record that on one voyage in 1899 with full bunkers she had only succeeded in doing seven knots. If this were her condition she had better be discarded. There was a further protest against the striking off of some ships which it now appeared had not been struck off. On the other hand, he instanced the "Arethusa" and the "Archer," and quoted from foreign navy lists cruisers of similar character still counted effective, and submitted the question as to whether we had not been premature and too comprehensive in our dismissal of ships. Referring to the First Lord's Statement, he pointed out that a reversal of policy in the matter of boilers was announced. Now Babcock and Yarrow boilers were in favour; but from the best information at his disposal, he was led to believe that the Belleville boiler was after all the best, the most economical in coal consumption, and possessing a great advantage in that it was capable of being mended at sea by refitting of tubes, whereas the others were likely to require repairing in a dockyard. He hoped that old prejudices would not be allowed to affect the question. With regard to the difference in type of destroyers, he expressed misgivings. He knew not whether economy was the main object, as suggested by the hon. Member for Yarmouth; but it seemed not impossible that confusion and mischief might ensue. If an admiral were supplied or reinforced with the wrong type, a situation might be produced analogous to that arising out of the alleged message, "Infantry preferred," at the outbreak of war in South Africa. The Secretary to the Admiralty had briefly answered his inquiries as to the Naval Volunteers by saying that they were being trained to take their place in the Fleet upon the outbreak of war. Yes, but the Secretary of State for War was in his place, and he had announced that the Volunteer soldier was practically useless for purposes of modern warfare. Naval training was manifestly more technical and specialised than military training and they could only hope that they would not presently be told that the time and money spent on the Naval Volunteer service had been wasted and must be discontinued.

*Mr. Pretyman rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham), who spoke seated and with his hat on, asked whether it was in order for a Minister to closure one of his own supporters before the hon. Member had finished his remarks.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The closure can be moved at any time.

Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley), seated and with his hat on, asked whether the whole naval policy of the Government could be discussed on Vote I.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the practice had always been, after a discussion on Vote A, that if there was a general assent of the House to that course, a general discussion might, with the approval of the Chairman, be taken on Vote I.

Mr. LOUGH said about an hour and a quarter ago, in reply to a question, he was told that the subject he referred to would be fully opened on the next Vote, and no objection was taken, and it was under those conditions that the debate had been continued.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: No such question was put to me, and I must be satisfied that there is a general assent of the House.

Mr. LOUGH submitted that when they received such a promise from a Minister it should settle the matter.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL asked if the general assent of the House had been obtained.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that under the circumstances, on Vote I., if no objection was taken by hon. Gentlemen on either side of the House, he should rule that a general discussion was in order.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 44.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn' B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon, Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Heath, Sir James (Staffords, N. W
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks N. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hon. Sir H. E. Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh're
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants).
Moore, William
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham

Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remmant, James Farquharson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marlyebone W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Carr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirC.E.H (Sheffield)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William, (Cork N.E
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Burke, E. Haviland
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsay(Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Duffy, William J.
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemphill, Rt. Hon.Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H.(Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr.CharlesFredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Seely, Maj J. E.B. (Isle of Wight
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyar, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters (N. Dorset
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Buchanan and Mr. J. H. Whitley.

Question put accordingly, "That 129,000 officers, seamen, and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906, including 20,211 Royal Marines."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 215; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 45.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allen, Charles P.
Anson Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Rt Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J E (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard. B.
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Heath, Sir James (Staffords, N W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Laurie, Lieut-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks, N R
Leyland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Freder'k N. S.
Lockwood, Lieut-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Laren, Sir C. Benjamin
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n)
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Moore, William
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Peel, Hn. Wm R. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S,
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, J Farquharson
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rose, Charles Day
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter

Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel Herbert L. (Cleveland
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H, (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J G (Oxf'd Univ.)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wills, Arthur Walters (N Dorset
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Burke, E. Haviland
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galwy
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Duffy, William J.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Flynn, James Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Higham, John Sharpe
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kennedy, Vincent P (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Russell, T. W.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Charles Hobhouse.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported this day.

Committee to sit again To-morrow.

ALIENS.

Address for "Return showing the names of all Aliens to whom certificates of naturalisation have been issued, and whose oaths of allegiance have, between the 1st day of January, 1904, and the 31st day of December, 1904, been registered at the Home Office, giving the country and place of residence of the person naturalised, and including information as to any Aliens who have during the same period obtained Acts of Naturalisation from the Legislature (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 124, of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

PRIVILEGES.

Ordered, That the Committee of Privileges do consist of Seven Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of—Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. A.J. Balfour, Mr. Blake, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. John Edward Ellis, and Mr. Halsey.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

PUBLIC PETITIONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions Presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House; and that the Reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed. And that such Committee have power to direct the printing *in extenso* of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions, as shall appear to require it. And that such Committee have power to report their opinion and observations thereupon to the House.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of—Mr. Allsopp, Mr. Edward Barry, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Mr. Brymer, Sir Charles Dalrymple, Colonel Legge, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Sir Henry Meysey-Thompson, Mr. Charles Morley, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Philipps, Mr. Tollemache, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, and Mr. Henry Joseph Wilson.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

SALE OF INTOXICANTS TO CHILDREN BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 98.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Motion for the adjournment of the House,

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire Wellington) announced that in consequence of a delay at the printers the first Order to-morrow (Tuesday) would be Vote I. of the Navy Estimates.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would understand that there was a strong feeling that at least at one stage of these Estimates there should be a general discussion, when a free hand should be given without the closure.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) asked if one of the reasons why the Government had altered their programme was that there was less danger of defeat upon the Navy Votes than upon the Supplementary Estimates.

[No answer was returned.]

Adjourned at twenty-nine minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 14th March, 1905.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London Squares and Enclosures (Preservation) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Sheffield University Bill [H.L.]; Bristol Blind Asylum Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a}, and committed.

University College, London (Transfer) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Metropolitan Railway Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on Thursday last, discharged, and Bill committed.

Preston Corporation (Ribble Navigation) Bill [H.L.]; Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.]; Truro Water Bill [H.L.]; Torpoint Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway Bill [H.L.]; Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Abinger be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Romilly; read, and agreed to.

Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Company Bill [H.L.]; East London and Lower Thames Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.]; City of London Electric Lighting Company Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Acton District) Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Electric Supply Company (Various Powers) Bill [H.L.]; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill [H.L.]; Central Electric Supply Bill [H.L.]; County of London Electric Supply Company Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Romilly be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Estcourt; read, and agreed to.

PETITIONS.

SUNDAY CLOSING (SHOPS) BILL [H.L.].

Petitions in favour of; of persons signing; Merthyr Tydfil Urban District Council; and members of Baptist Church, Dudley, Worcestershire. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 631. Coal Industry of the United States, 1903. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

STREET BETTING BILL [H.L.] (No. 27); MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL [H.L.] (No. 28).

Reported from the Standing Committee with an Amendment to each Bill. The Report thereof to be received on Thursday next; and Bills to be printed as amended.

SUNDAY CLOSING (SHOPS) BILL [H.L.].

[Second Reading].

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

***Lord AVEBURY**: My Lords, I have the honour to present a petition in favour of this Bill signed, as I am informed, by over 83,000 persons. The object of this Bill is to stop Sunday trading with some necessary exceptions. Sunday trading is indeed illegal even now, and so far we do not propose to alter the present law, but only to make it effective. At present the law is inoperative, because the fine is nominal. Any one who chooses to pay from £12 to £15 a year can snap his fingers at the law, set it at defiance and open every Sunday. This is surely an anomalous and very unsatisfactory state of things. The result is that Sunday trading is greatly on the increase. Shopkeepers assure me that unless something

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

is done, many more shops will soon be open. Even now in Leeds the number is estimated at over 2,000; in Glasgow, over 3,000; in Liverpool nearly 5,000; in Manchester and Salford 8,000; and in London, I am told, some 20,000.

The Bill is a very simple one. Clause 1 prohibits Sunday trading. Clause 2 specifies the fines, which are 5s. for the first offence, 20s. for the second, and £5 for the third and subsequent convictions. These are the fines proposed by the Government in their Shop Hours Act of last year. Clause 3 refers to the exemptions which are specified in the schedule. It also gives a certain latitude to local authorities, but perhaps your Lordships may think this unnecessary, in which case I should not press it. Clause 4 deals with machinery, adopting that in the Shop Hours Act of last year.

I now come to the schedules. We believe that any possible inconvenience to the poor will be obviated by the provision that perishable articles of food may be sold up to nine in the morning, and milk again in the afternoon. The Bill does not deal with public-houses or refreshment rooms. Last year we proposed to repeal the Sunday Act of Charles II. This was objected to and we have dropped the suggestion. No objection was made to the repeal of parts of the Bread Acts, but if the Government wish them retained I may say at once that we shall be guided by their views in the matter. With some regret we have excluded tobacconists, because they mainly compete with the public-house. The Lord's Day Rest Association, which strongly supports the Bill, and has issued an admirable statement in its favour, think that tobacconists might be included. This, as well as one or two other exemptions, will be questions for Committee.

The Bill, therefore, is simple, but its effects would be very far-reaching. It would profoundly influence the conditions of our great cities, and is enthusiastically supported by those concerned. I had hoped, after the passing of the Shop Hours Bill, that my work in this direction was over, but have found it impossible to resist the appeal made by shopkeepers and assistants all over the country. Last year my noble friend

Lord Belper pointed out that the law is enforced at present in very few places, and he argued that either, therefore, it is broken in few places, or the local authorities do not care to put it into operation. Now, I think I can convince your Lordships that this argument will not hold water.

Take Manchester. The law is infringed to a great extent. Is it that the local authority and local feeling are against Sunday closing? Not at all. Last year the Lord Mayor himself called a conference of Manchester shopkeepers at the Town Hall to consider the question. In his opening remarks the Lord Mayor stated that Sunday opening was on the increase. He expressed his own opinion that retail traders ought to have their Sundays to themselves, and that—

> "It is desirable that steps should be taken to prevent a continuance of the present state of things."

The meeting was large and representative. Mr. Kendall, the able secretary of the Manchester and District Grocers Association, moved, and Mr. Openshaw, president of the Manchester and District Meat Retailers Association, seconded a resolution declaring—

> "That this meeting of representatives of retail traders carrying on business in the city of Manchester regrets the alarming amount of Sunday trading conducted in Manchester, as shown by the recent canvass and fully borne out by the report presented to the Watch Committee by the Chief Constable, and in expressing their disapproval of trading on the Lord's Day (Sunday), appeal to all traders to close their business premises and cease to trade on Sundays."

This was carried almost unanimously. In Liverpool also the law is at present nugatory. But this is not because the local authority are unwilling to intervene. The town council have resolved—

> "That having regard to the large amount of Sunday trading in Liverpool, such being prejudicial to the best interests of the community, the Council petition the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary in support of Lord Avebury's Bill for the suppression of Sunday trading, and requesting that it be made a Government measure."

Our Bill, moreover, is strongly supported by the Liverpool Tradesmen's Associations. It is clear, therefore, that my noble friend's idea is untenable. I could, in fact, go through others of our greatest cities in the same way, but will only mention one other case—that of Hull. The corporation, to their honour, are anxious to put down the opening of shops on Sunday. They prosecute the shops which open, but the only result is a fine of 5s. The Chief Constable writes to me that the present law is not sufficient to cope with the evil, but that in his judgment our Bill would meet the case.

I think I shall be able to satisfy your Lordships that the shopkeeping community are really and keenly anxious for this Bill. I am speaking in the presence of several noble Lords who were members of the Committee on Early Closing. They will, I am sure, confirm me when I say—indeed it is so stated in our unanimous Report—that though it was not comprised in our inquiry, many of the witnesses impressed on us very strongly the necessity for some such measure as that now before your Lordships. It is supported, as regards the grocery trade, by the Grocers Federation, by the Northern Councils of Grocers Associations, by the Grocers Associations of Bath, Belfast, Blackburn, Bristol, Cardiff, Darlington, Exeter, Leeds, Liverpool, Oldham, Portsmouth, Sheffield, Southampton, Swansea, Swindon, and Torquay. As regards butchers, I may mention the Butchers Associations of London, Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, and Yorkshire. Among other trades I may mention, for instance, the Federated Association of Fruiterers and Florists, and the National Federation of Hairdressers, with their affiliated branches all over the kingdom too numerous to mention. It is under the auspices of their energetic secretary, Mr. Judson, that the monster petition has been prepared which is on your Lordships' Table. Then there are a number of local general Tradesmen's Associations which support us, including the National Chamber of Trade, a very important organisation; the Tradesmen's Associations of Liverpool, Birmingham, and Bootle; the Council of Irish Traders, the Oldham Chamber of Trade, the Manchester Retail Traders' Association, and the Mid-Rhondda Chamber of Trade. Last, but not least, the Scottish shopkeepers are organised as a whole rather than in separate trades, and their two great associations, the Scottish Shopkeepers and Shop Assistants' Union and the Scottish Traders Defence Association, are giving us their strongest possible support.

Your Lordships will see, therefore, that so far as the shopkeeping community is concerned the consensus of opinion is very great, and there are two circumstances which render it even more overwhelming. The measure has, as your Lordships see, been considered by shopkeepers, associations all over the country; yet so far as I am aware there is not one which opposes the Bill; and, secondly, in almost every case the resolution in its favour has been unanimous. Moreover, I would ask your Lordships to consider how unfairly the law works at present. The majority of shopkeepers conform to it, but a large minority set it at defiance. Of these, again, the majority would gladly close if all did so, but consider themselves compelled to open because their rivals do so. Those who really wish to open are, I believe, a very small minority. Now it is obvious that this state of things places the shopkeepers who obey the law at an unfair disadvantage.

Now, my Lords, you will perhaps ask how it is that so many shops open if they desire to close. Some of my noble friends who were on the Early Closing Committee asked many questions on this point, and the answer always was that if any open, those who are doing the same class of business are compelled to open also. I may give an illustration. One of my correspondents writes to me that being much opposed to Sunday trading he determined to keep closed. In a short time he lost most of his little capital, and then he opened and made money. When he thought he had made enough he closed again, and now he writes me word that he is nearly ruined again, and compelled once more to open; and he ends his letter, "I am a hatter." If I do not dwell on the assistants it is because the measure is so obviously in their interest that I believe I may say they support it unanimously. I do not, therefore, weary your Lordships by going into detail to show this, but I would strongly urge that the extreme importance of the Sunday closing to the health, happiness, and character of shop assistants must, and I feel sure will, commend the Bill to your favourable consideration.

I now pass to another class of evidence: local authorities often abstain from resolutions which may seem to be of a political character. Nevertheless, as I have already shown, we are supported by several authorities, and perhaps in this category it will be sufficient to mention the Liverpool Town Council and the council of the Urban District Councils Association, which comprises 480 district councils.

Now, my Lords, you will naturally ask whether the measure would inconvenience working men. We think we have sufficiently provided for this by allowing the sale of perishable articles up to nine o'clock in the morning. But what do the working men themselves say? The London Trades Council has passed a resolution that in their judgment all shops should be shut on one day in the week. They add, "not necessarily Sunday," but of course it must obviously be Sunday. The Irish Trades Council have passed a resolution in our support, and so have the trades councils of several districts—I may mention those of Hull, Bristol, Walsall, Nottingham—and the National Union of Enginemen and Tramwaymen. As regards Scotland, Mr. Cooper, secretary to the Trades Defence Association, writes me word that he has seen the secretary of the Scottish Trades Council, and that they also are in favour of the measure. As regards the general public, I may refer to the petitions in favour of the measure presented both last year and this, especially the monster petition with more than 83,300 signatures. On the other hand, though this proposal has been for several years under consideration, there is, so far, practically no opposition.

The importance, I might almost add the necessity, of a day's rest cannot be overestimated. As Macaulay well said—

> "While industry is suspended, while the plough lies in the furrow, while the exchange is silent, while no smoke ascends from the factory, a process is going on quite as important to the wealth of the nation as any process which is performed on more busy days. Man, the machine of machines, is repairing, winding up, so that he returns to his labours on Monday with clearer intellect, with livelier spirits, with renewed corporeal vigour."

Lord Avebury.

My Lords, I have commended this measure to you so far on grounds of health and happiness. But it appeals also to the religious feeling of the country. In the presence of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and other reverend Prelates, it is not for me to speak of the Church of England, but I may say that I have had numerous resolutions from Nonconformist congregations all over the country supporting the Bill. We were advised last year to let sleeping dogs lie. But, my Lords, the dogs are not sleeping, and are not disposed to let things lie as they are. I have shown your Lordships that the law is in an anomalous, unsatisfactory, and even absurd position; that to render it effective, as we propose, would create no serious inconvenience; that the working men approve; that those immediately concerned, ardently, enthusiastically, and by an overwhelming majority, support the proposal; that it would greatly promote the health, happiness, and character of the community; and, lastly, I believe that it appeals to, and is approved by, the conscience of the nation. I beg to move the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I ask your Lordships' leave to say a few words in support of the Motion which has been moved by the noble Lord opposite, who has identified himself with so many efforts of this kind for the public good and advantage. I hope that your Lordships will consent to give a Second Reading to this Bill, although that would be, if my wish were followed, with certain conditions and restrictions which I will refer to in a few moments. I do not think that there is any subject that can come before your Lordships, of a practical kind concerning the ordinary welfare of the people at large, which is more difficult to handle than this particular subject.

Last year, when the noble Lord introduced a Bill similar in some respects to the measure which is before you now, I ventured to plead for a period of delay during which we might make further inquiry into the actual need that exists for our intervention. The public, as it seemed to me, were not at that time really aware of what the proposition was which was being submitted, and it seemed to me as if we might almost inadvertently slip into the taking of some important step which we might afterwards find had been taken without due deliberation. But since that time I at least, and I doubt not many other noble Lords, have received abundant evidence showing that the interest in the question has grown, and that, as Lord Avebury has truly said, it is no use remarking, "Let sleeping dogs lie," because the question is awake. It is being stirred, and the time, it seems to me, has come when some forward action on our part is practically necessary. I at least desire that we should now take courage and make some definite step in the direction which the noble Lord advocates.

The correspondence which I have had upon this subject, and not a few of the interviews with which I have been favoured by those who are interested in it, have shown me how widespread still is the general misunderstanding and confusion as to what is at this moment the actual position of the law on these Sunday questions. In this House your Lordships are no doubt familiar with the facts, but I am quite sure that is not so in the country at large. Sunday observance has caused a great deal of controversy, and has been the subject of enactments of different sorts, ecclesiastical and civil, through every period of English history.

Legislators, civil and ecclesiastical, have again and again tried to decide about the recreations which ought to be legitimate, morally and legally, on Sunday, and strange stories come to us from the past as to how that question was dealt with. In the "Book of Sports" of James I., which took the form of law in the first year of Charles I., elaborate rules were laid down as to what recreations might be indulged in on Sunday and what recreations ought to be peremptorily forbidden. Then came a tremendous reaction, and the restraints of the years that followed form a strange episode in English history, both religious and secular. There were restrictions on actual physical movement, as, for example, that no man should be allowed to go faster than a walk on Sunday. This restriction was modified indeed, as your Lordships may remember, by one peculiar clause dealing with the episode when a man's hat might be blown off on Sunday. The question then arose, what should the man do in such a case as that? It was enacted, as perhaps some of your Lordships may remember, that he might run after his hat if he ran "reverently." Such was the mode in which these matters were dealt with in the Puritan period.

In the following century the subject was again tackled with considerable resolution, particularly as to the nature of the entertainments which might be given, and the places of amusement that might be open; and that branch of the subject was dealt with nine years ago with great care by your Lordships, who referred the matter to a Select Committee, on which I had the honour of sitting. A very elaborate Report was presented to this House, which I need not refer to further because it culminated in a final Resolution, which received the approval of the House, stating that, while the phraseology of the earlier Act was now inappropriate, and the alteration of such phraseology would be expedient, the existing law as laid down in the statutes corresponded substantially with the wishes and sentiments of the English people, and that any material change in its general provisions would be harmful rather than advantageous.

Therefore, we can leave out of sight legislation and attempted legislation dealing with recreation and amusement, and fall back on the far graver question of the legislation dealing with the branches of trade and labour which may be properly sanctioned on Sunday. Upon that point the main statute that exists is, of course, the statute of Charles II, which definitely enacts that no person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry, show forth, or expose for sale any wares or merchandise on the Lord's Day, or any part thereof, upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit the goods exposed. That was subsequently so far amended that an infraction of the Act is met by the trumpery fine to which the noble Lord has referred—a fine which in the case of any lucrative branch of trade is absolutely ineffectual. The old law has further been restricted in its operation by the Act passed some thirty years ago, that no prosecution shall be instituted except by, and with the consent in writing of, the chief officer of police of the district, of two justices of the peace, or of a stipendiary magistrate having jurisdiction in the place where such offence is committed.

The law at this moment, therefore, is that all trading on Sunday is practically forbidden; but the law has become in many places a dead letter, and in very large branches of trade a quite futile enactment, because of the double restriction that the fine must not exceed 5s., and that a prosecution shall not be instituted without the sanction I have quoted. I do not in the least find fault with the second restriction, because obviously there should be something to prevent frivolous or trumpery prosecutions. But the fact that the Act has become inoperative in practice has encouraged those who in our own day have desired to go forward in the direction of an increase of Sunday trading to step forward boldly without much fear of harmful consequences. The testimony is, so far as I know, quite universal that, as regards our great towns, there is an immense increase of Sunday trading, and that the increase is going rapidly forward. That is due mainly to two causes—at least, so it seems to me. The first is the very large increase of the barrow or costermonger trade, which is conducted in the open street and has now reached dimensions so formidable that it is practically impossible for the small shopkeeper to compete with the costermonger or the vendor from a barrow or stall, if he is obliged to have his shop closed on Sunday while the barrow-trade may still go on. The other reason is that in London, and in the East End particularly, the increase of the foreign element of the population, and especially the Jewish element, has operated in the same direction, and complicates the problem considerably when we try to deal with it. Anyhow, the opinion has, I can say for certain, found expression among the vast number of those who are really best qualified, in the widest spirit, to look at this matter all round, that we can no longer let the matter alone, and that the time has now come when it must be dealt with in some way or other. That opinion, so far as I know, has the general consent of all those who have the best interests of the people at heart.

In many regions—I can speak for parts of London—an endeavour has been made to ascertain, not merely through the associations to which the noble Lord has referred, but by taking a census from shop to shop, what shopkeepers themselves feel on this matter. I have here a list of such a census taken in a large district in East London, and it shows that the proportion of shopkeepers anxious to have Sunday trading put an end to compared to those who were prepared to allow it to go on was 541 to 137, and I have reason to believe that that is a sample of the statistics which might be procured from any district in which the difficulty at present exists. But I entirely admit that we must proceed with the greatest caution and care if we are to go forward at all. It is by no means plain sailing; our action needs to be safeguarded lest we inadvertently do an injustice.

The views of shopkeepers and tradesmen, important as they are, constitute only one element, and perhaps not the most important element, in the consideration of a question of this kind. The noble Marquess who for so many years led this House, and who spoke more than once upon this subject with all the weight which attached to him personally as well as to the office he held, used to be constantly reminding us that what we had to consider in these matters was not merely the wishes of the shopkeepers or sellers, but those of the general public, the purchasers who gave the demand for such trade, either in evenings or on Sundays, as we were trying to restrain. I believe that to be absolutely true; but, of course, the task is a very difficult one of ascertaining in any quite clear and concrete form what is the opinion of those classes who are affected as purchasers in a problem of this sort. However, we have tried to ascertain it in such ways as seem to be possible.

The noble Lord has referred to what has been said by trades unions—not trades unions composed of the shop-keeping community, but of the people who themselves, or through their families, are purchasers. That is, as far as I know, as good a criterion as is readily available for discovering what the popular opinion on this subject is. I have also had inquiries made at large gatherings of working women and among girls' clubs and the like, attended by the class of people who would be the ordinary purchasers in the kind of shops which would be affected by this Bill. Although there is not a unanimous opinion on the subject—it is exceedingly difficult, in a constituency of that kind, to get an exact or statistical answer to a question—yet there can be no doubt at all, and I challenge inquiry about it, that there is a very large preponderance of opinion on the part of those best entitled to be listened to among the working classes that there is no real necessity for anything like the amount of Sunday trading which is going on at this moment. Such is also the opinion of some of the best of the leaders and spokesmen of the working classes Mr. John Burns and many more have spoken to the effect that Sunday observance is a vital matter in the interests of the working class. At the same time I admit to the full that it is the duty of those who advocate a measure of this kind to show that it not only pleases the shopkeepers, who might be accused of caring mainly for their own respite, and being careless as to the public convenience, but also that it is in no respect unfair to those whom we may call the purchasing public.

There is a variety of view about the details of what ought to be done, but there is, as far as I can see, a practical consensus of opinion on the principle which underlies the Bill now before your Lordships. It is, indeed, one of those measures which very largely turns, as regards its practicability and effectiveness, upon the exceptions in the schedules, upon the way in which the rule is to be modified in practice in favour of certain branches of trade and merchandise, and for that reason it seems to me that some further inquiry, with the formal taking of evidence from the spokesmen of those who would be affected by it, is eminently desirable before the measure takes legislative effect. My great hope is that your Lordships will, by reading the Bill a second time to-night, assert the principle that some measure of the kind is wanted, and will then refer it to a Select Committee, who shall inquire particularly into the kind of points I have referred to with a view to making the measure a workable one. After such an inquiry we should be in a better position to go forward than we are now.

There are a great many points which will have to be much further considered before a Bill like this can actually become law—I refer to such points as the purchase of perishable provisions, and especially the purchase of meat in summer weather by families who live in only one room. Then, again, in express terms, the Bill exempts from exemption, if I may use such a phrase, hairdressers and barbers. Now, I confess that, though no section of the community has approached me on this subject with anything like the volume of unanimity that the hairdressers of England have, I yet remain to some little degree unconverted as to the absolute necessity of closing barbers' shops on Sunday morning. I admit that the Sunday business is so heavy that it inflicts hardship upon those who have adopted that honourable profession, but none the less, the needs of the public do seem to me to be met in that particular respect in a way which I should not like to see curtailed without further and formal inquiry as to the feeling of the customers who would mainly be affected. But if you look at the nature of the articles which are sold in most of the large London markets on Sunday—in East Street, Walworth; in Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, and elsewhere—you will find that, far from their being solely perishable articles meeting the special wants of the moment, there are ten times as many things on sale which are not in that sense perishable at all. Crockery, birds and rabbits, and pets of different kinds, flowers and plants, and clothing, old and new, form the very large preponderance of the marketable articles. It is the trade in these articles, and not in the perishable necessities to which I have referred, that we must endeavour to curtail, and I am certain that inquiry would elicit the fact that it could be done without any genuine hardship being inflicted upon the purchasing public.

I am perfectly well aware that dealing with this subject at all is an action fraught with peril. There is danger lest when we begin to handle it we may find we are led on, against our will perhaps, into the repeal of wholesome existing enactments, or into a general treatment of the subject which would lead in a direction opposite to what most of us would desire. But I think the time has come when that risk must be run, because not only is the evil great but it is steadily growing, and when that is the case, the kind of consideration I have referred to loses a great deal of its force. The evil has reached that stage that if we are ever to step in we ought to step in now, lest it increase to a degree which will place it altogether beyond our control. I believe that at this moment we are face to face in our great towns with the prospect of that Sunday relaxation, that rest from work on Sunday, which has been so long a marked characteristic of English life, being seriously imperilled.

Of course, I need not say that, in my own case, and in the case of those who act specially with me in a matter of this kind, the religious element of the question is predominant in our minds. But I want to emphasise the fact that it is not upon that ground that I am arguing the matter to-night. There are other places and other occasions upon which that line of argument may be more suitably followed. But I am supporting the Bill to-night on the wider, more popular, and less controverted line that the general well-being of the people as a whole requires the day of rest and the day of recreation, in the true sense of the word, which Sunday ought to be and happily is, in most parts of England, from the ceaseless grind and worry of modern life. That is what I desire to safeguard and protect, and that is what I believe may be imperilled unless we step in and take some action for its protection. Hitherto it has been possible in our great cities for the denizens to have one day out of seven during which there can be some respite from the clamour and whirl which goes on throughout the week, but we are in some danger lest that day of rest should become a day of labour without any commensurate good to the public at large. As I have said, I think careful inquiry is necessary as to the manner in which the proposed legislation should take effect. Therefore, I hope the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee. I believe we should then find that we could amend the existing law with practically the unanimous consent of all those who, from different points of view, have truly at heart the best interests of the English people.

Lord BELPER: My Lords, although this is practically the same Bill as the noble Lord brought forward last session, I fully recognise that there has been since then some progress with regard to this question. The speech which has just been addressed to the House by the most reverend Primate marks a distinct step in that direction which cannot be ignored. I do not, therefore, in the least complain that the noble Lord has again brought the Bill forward, for I fully recognise that the question, having got to this point, requires the fullest consideration. I do not wish for a moment to enter into any controversy with my noble friend in charge of the Bill as to the facts which he has laid before us in regard to the views of the shopkeeping community, but I may remind him that I opposed the Bill last year, not so much with regard to its details, but because I ventured to think that there were other considerations which must have the greatest weight in dealing with this question; and I can appeal to no stronger argument in support of this view than that used last year by the most reverend Primate, who said then, as he has said to-night, that this was a question of the utmost delicacy and difficulty, and one which he deprecated touching without fuller information than we have before us.

The Motion which has been moved by my noble friend is that the Bill should be read a second time, and the suggestion has been thrown out by the most reverend Primate that, after having been read a second time, the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. I desire to point out that if the Bill is read a second time before being referred to a Select Committee, it would not only be practically admitting the principle of the Bill, but would prevent the Select Committee from going into the whole question of Sunday trading by restricting them within the four corners of this small measure. My suggestion, therefore, on behalf of His Majesty Government, is that there should be an inquiry, but an inquiry before reading the Bill a second time, so that the House shall have full information on all the facts of the case before it attempts legislation. As the most reverend Primate has said, it is necessary to approach this question with great care and caution. The matter does call for further inquiry, and it is impossible for the House to ignore the arguments which have been brought forward. In these circumstances I ask your Lordships not to read the Bill the second time, but to assent to the Amendment which I am authorised to move, namely—

> "That this House is not prepared to legislate on this subject without further information as to the facts of the case; and that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the conditions under which Sunday trading is now permitted by law."

I think that even my noble friend who moved the Second Reading of this Bill will recognise that if a Committee of that sort is appointed it will mark a distinct step foward in this matter, and he will be able to congratulate himself that he has at least taken the first step to a satisfactory conclusion.

Amendment moved—

> "To leave out all the words after the word 'That' for the purpose of inserting the following words 'This House is not prepared to legislate on this subject without further information as to the facts of the case; and that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the conditions under which Sunday trading is now permitted by law.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

THE EARL OF ABERDEEN: My Lords, I do not know whether my noble friend Lord Avebury will be disposed to accept the Amendment proposed by the noble Lord on behalf of the Government. I am inclined to hope that if he has the prospect of sufficient support to carry it, he will adhere to the Motion. I think it was clear from the able speech of the most reverend Primate that there would be a good deal for the Committee to do even if they were restricted to the consideration of the provisions of this Bill. The noble Lord who spoke for His Majesty's Government says that the whole question of Sunday trading should be dealt with. To a great extent we may say that the Bill as it stands does deal with what is generally included in the expression Sunday trading. As to the provisions of the Bill it is quite evident, from the measure itself, and especially after the explanation of the noble mover, that it is not intended to prevent people from doing any business on Sunday which they wish to do, but to protect people from being compelled to do business on Sunday which they do not want to do. It has been said that any one who desires to do so can close his business on Sunday, but, human nature being what it is, we can easily understand that it is felt to be intolerable by a shopkeeper that others who take advantage of his adherence to the general custom of the country by observing the Sabbath should be allowed to carry on business to his detriment.

It is quite clear also that this proposed legislation cannot be described as puritanical. As the most reverend Primate has truly said, the Bill proceeds mainly on the principle of the general welfare, and it would be a little late in the day to object to the Bill on the ground that it interferes with the liberty of the individual, since Parliament has already recognised in kindred legislation that it is in the general interest that there should be certain restrictions on liberty of action. The Bill is sufficiently on the lines of what has already been sanctioned by Parliament to prevent its being described as the thin end of the wedge, or as importing a new principle into our legislation. As to the details, I cannot help thinking that my noble friend has been very tender to one class of trader, namely the tobacconist. Smoking requisites can easily be laid in beforehand. It may be true that a man cannot lay in a stock of draught beer to last over Sunday, but I have observed that smokers exercise wonderful forethought in the matter of their supply of tobacco, and it cannot be said that any hardship would result from closing tobacconists' shops on Sunday. In Scotland public-houses are closed all day on Sunday, except to travellers, and if it is possible in Scotland for public-houses to be closed on Sunday, I cannot see why, in England, tobacconists should be allowed to keep their shops open during the whole of that day. Tobacconists, like other people, should be spared the annoyance of having to keep open during the whole of Sunday. The most reverend Primate referred to the views of working-men's wives, who largely form the purchasers on Sunday, and indicated that the majority of that class are in favour of Sunday closing. We can easily understand that when they know that shops will be open on Sunday, husbands of a certain class will not take the trouble to give their wives the requisite money for purchases until Sunday morning, but if they know that the shops will be closed they will, for their own sake, take care to provide their wives with the necessary money on the Saturday. That difficulty would, therefore, be removed. I do not know whether my noble friend will accept the Amendment, but if he does not, and goes to a division, I shall certainly support him.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I should like to say a few words on this matter, particularly in view of the stage at which it has now arrived. My noble friend behind me has made a very clear statement on the subject, and has spoken strongly in favour of the Second Reading. He was followed by the most rev. Primate, who has peculiar means of knowing the opinions of the people concerned, and who strongly supported the general principle of the Bill, though he thought some of its details ought to be further considered. I have been very much struck by the arguments which have been used, and I consider that the case for a Bill of this sort has been abundantly proved. There is a strong consensus of opinion in favour of closing earlier on Sunday, and it is also considered that exceptions should be made. There is a view of the religious necessities which may be put forward. I am not, however, going to argue that; but, certainly, from another point of view, it is of enormous importance for the country that we should maintain, if possible, the greater part, if not the whole, of the Sunday holiday. It is not good, I am convinced, for any man, however industrious and energetic he may be, to work during the whole seven days in the week.

I protest against the subject being at once sent to a Select Committee. I think it is most important that your Lordships should give an opinion on the general principle of the Bill. If the Motion for the Second Reading is agreed to the Bill might then be sent, as the most rev. Primate has suggested, to a Select Committee. The noble Lord who spoke on behalf of the Government said he objected to the House agreeing to the general principle of the Bill. I am not a lawyer and may be wrong, but I maintain that no new principle will be established by passing the Second Reading, since the principle of stopping Sunday trading exists in the present law. I sincerely hope your Lordships will not agree to the Amendment, but will vote for the Second Reading and let the Bill then be submitted to a Select Committee.

THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER: My Lords, I desire to associate myself very heartily with this Bill, and to express the hope that your Lordships will give it a Second Reading. The necessity for remedying the evil to which the noble Lord called attention is felt very deeply in our large towns, and the larger the town is the stronger, I believe, is that feeling. In those great towns where the population is for the most part exceedingly poor, such legislation is acutely needed. I hold that legislation in this direction, instead of adding to the restrictions of the people, will very largely add to their liberty. The small trader, who has to exert himself throughout the week, finds himself compelled, through the excess of competition, to choose between complying with the law and shutting his shop on Sunday, or infringing the law and opening it. The loyal man who shuts his shop finds himself at a disadvantage in comparison with his neighbour who does not, and he feels sore at heart that because he is loyal to the law he should suffer by the diversion of custom to his less conscientious competitor. This Bill is, I am sure, welcomed by a very large portion of the retail traders throughout the country. In places like Liverpool and Portsmouth the evil is very great, and especially in regard to the hawkers' trade carried on in the streets. This Bill will remedy what is felt to be a cruel disability on small traders. I am also convinced that anything that can be done by Parliament to give the working classes greater liberty for relaxation and rest on Sunday will be heartily welcomed by the country at large. The working classes look hopefully and anxiously for this extension of their freedom, and I am sure the passing of the Bill will be heartily welcomed in our large towns.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I wish to say, at the outset, that I think an injustice was done to the noble Lord who spoke on behalf of His Majesty's Government by the suggestion of the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, that he (Lord Belper) objected to the principle of the Bill. Lord Belper said nothing of the sort. What the noble Lord stated was, that if the Select Committee were confined to this particular Bill they could not enter into the whole subject of Sunday trading. I am sure the noble Earl unconsciously misrepresented my noble friend. The subject is of a much more complicated character than has been assumed. I think that some of the proposals of the Bill are intended obviously more for the accommodation of those who are well off than for those who are poor. One of the exempted trades is the tobacco trade. Will anyone give me a reason why that trade should be exempted from the prohibition? Again, I observe that newsagents are exempted. This is another trade the carrying on of which on Sunday is especially agreeable to the rich. On the other hand, I find a special section prohibiting barbers from carrying on business on Sunday. Can anyone give a good and substantial reason why barbers should be specially mentioned for prohibition? I know that some years ago, when there was a very violent effort on the part of those who took a stricter view of Sunday observance, an attempt was made to bring the whole law on the subject into contempt and ridicule by a series of prosecutions which, I believe, were only stopped by the magistrates declining to convict; but why this particular trade of the barber should be selected for special prohibition I am wholly unable to conjecture.

The whole subject is an extremely difficult one. In my opinion the Bill is very imperfect, and I confess that I would have liked to have a more general inquiry than is possible by a Select Committee on a particular measure. So far I agree with my noble friend Lord Belper; but I recognise that it seems to be the view of your Lordships generally that there should be an inquiry, and rather than appear to impose any difficulty in the way of such an inquiry I would ask my noble friend to withdraw his Amendment and allow the Bill to be read a second time. At the same time, I think that one must recognise how serious and important the question is. Take the religious question. A great deal of the trading in the East End to which the most rev. Primate has referred is conducted by persons who are not Christians and who do not recognise the sanctity of the Christian Sabbath. Yet these people, who are prohibited by their own religion from trading on Saturday, will be prohibited by the Bill from trading on Sunday also.

Again, there is the question whether this is not rather a case of the smaller traders against the costermongers, who undoubtedly have established an enormous trade in the poorer districts. If the Bill were passed in its present form the whole of that class of traders, who are a great accommodation to the poorest classes, would be prevented, from carrying on their business. I hope that it will not be supposed that I make light of the Christian obligation to observe the Sunday. I was for some years Chairman of the Lord's Day Observance Society, and I am certainly not inclined to suggest in the smallest degree that the observance of the Sabbath is not important; but, at the same time, one cannot but feel that in our complex civilisation it is sometimes very inexpedient to try to draw the string too tight. If you do so it snaps. I think that the importance of keeping the Sunday as a day of rest is being gradually recognised by mankind to such an extent that it does not require the stimulus of legislation. By driving that feeling too hard we are apt to hinder rather than to assist the movement. Rather than run counter to the desire of the House, however, in regard to this particular Bill, I would ask my noble friend to withdraw the Amendment.

*LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, I need hardly say that I have listened with great satisfaction to the conclusion of the speech of the Lord Chancellor. Perhaps I may explain that the reason why tobacconists were excluded from the operation of the Bill was that they alleged that the public-houses came into competition with them, and that it was not fair that they should be compelled to close when public-houses were allowed to remain open. As to the special mention of barbers, that was due to the fact that the Barbers' Associations throughout the country were most anxious to come under the Bill, and they were afraid that they would not do so unless they were specially mentioned.

LORD BELPER: I beg to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee.

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 14th March, 1905.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Ealing Corporation Bill [by Order]. Read a second time, and committed.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Bill to omit Clause 89 of the Bill.—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP D).

Captain JESSEL reported from the Committee on Group D of Private Bills; That the parties opposing the Sunderland and South Shields Water Bill had stated that the evidence of Mr. William Matthews, of 19, French Street, Southampton, Engineer, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Mr. William Matthews do attend the said Committee to-morrow, at Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Mr. William Matthews do attend the Committee on Group D of Private Bills to-morrow, at Eleven of the clock.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Select Committee—

1. "That, in the case of the Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

2. "That, in the case of the Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Tramways Nos. 1 and 2 are struck out of the Bill unless the consent of the Northamptonshire County Council and that of the Wellingborough Rural District Council are proved before the Committee on the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

3. "That, in the case of the Llandrindod Wells Urban District Council Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that all reference to the payment of the costs of the Bill for 1903 be omitted from the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

4. "That, in the case of the Hastings Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That

the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Clause 7 be struck out of the Bill unless the consent of the Corporation of Bexhill is proved before the Committee on the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

5. "That, in the case of the Darien Gold Mining Company Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

6. "That, in the case of the Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway (No. 2) Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of the 'Trustees of the Will of the late Alexander Jones,' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought not to be dispensed with."

7. "That, in the case of the Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of the 'Portadown Urban District Council,' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought not to be dispensed with."

8. "That, in the case of the North East London Railway Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of the 'Trustees of the Will of the late Alexander Jones,' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought not to be dispensed with."

First Five Resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN CLUBS.

Petition from Bradford, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petition from Bolton, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD.

Report [presented 13th March] to be printed. [No. 83.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3328 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 631 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Public Records (Inland Revenue Department (Estate Duty Office) Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents in the Department of the Inland Revenue (Estate Duty Office) which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Free Grants of Seed in Loughrea Rural District.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the resolutions unanimously passed by the Loughrea Rural District Council on the 12th January last, with reference to the poverty and distress existing in the congested and other districts of the union; and whether, having regard to the necessities of the case, he will bring the matter at once under the notice of the Congested Districts Board and the Board of Agriculture, so that free grants of suitable seeds may be given to the very poor occupiers living in those districts.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Board of Guardians of Loughrea Union have accepted tenders for the supply of over 250 tons of seed potatoes, and the union will be entitled to a share of the grant made by the Department of Agriculture towards the reduction of the price of seed to the purchasers. It is not the intention of either of the Departments referred to, to give free grants of seed to occupiers of land in this or any other union.

Learners in the Post Office.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the number of learners appointed to post offices in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively for the years 1902, 1903, and 1904, under open competition and under a qualifying examination on the nomination of the local postmaster respectively.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I will furnish the hon. Member with a statement giving the information asked for, which could not conveniently be given in an Answer in the House.

Number of Learners appointed during the years 1902–4.

	1902.		1903.		1904.	
	By open competition.	By qualifying examination.	By open competition.	By qualifying examination.	By open competition.	By qualifying examination.
England and Wales:—						
(*a*) London - -	254	—	181	—	93	—
(*b*) Provinces - -	539	1,137	415	960	158	487
Scotland - - - -	125	153	76	95	58	53
Ireland - - - -	104	141	91	98	29	18
Totals - -	1,022	1,431	763	1,153	338	558

Postal Arrangements in Liscarroll and Churchtown Districts (County Cork).

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the attention of the Department has been called to the unsatisfactory postal arrangements in Liscarroll and Churchtown districts, county Cork, and to the fact that the mails now arrive in Liscarroll about 8.15 a.m., and are despatched from there about 5 p.m.; and whether, in view of the fact that important fairs, petty sessions Courts, butter and produce markets are regularly held in this town, the Department will arrange that letters shall arrive at about 7 a.m. and be not despatched earlier than say 7 p.m., so as to provide adequate time for traders to conduct their correspondence.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It is the fact that the mails now arrive at Liscarroll at 8.10 a.m., but the despatch is made, except during the four winter months, at 6 p.m. A scheme for improving the service was considered some time ago; but, as it was then found that it could not be carried out without causing serious hardship to the postman, it was not proceeded with pending an alteration in the circumstances. I will, however, inquire whether any further steps can now be taken in the matter.

Ventilation of Public Telephone Call-Boxes.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Postmaster-General whether arrangements can be made to ventilate public telephone call-boxes.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The telephone silence boxes used by the Post Office are already ventilated as thoroughly as is consistent with the privacy of conversations and the exclusion of outside noise. The point has received a good deal of attention, and the system adopted is, it is thought, the best that can be devised.

Post Office Railway Sub-Offices.

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the Postmaster-General how many municipal boroughs in Great Britain with a population of over 20,000 are classed by the Post Office as railway sub-offices, and what are the names of these boroughs.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I understand that there are three municipal boroughs in Great Britain with a population of over 20,000 at which the principal post office is a railway sub-office. The names of these boroughs are: Gillingham (Kent), 43,000; Ilkeston, 25,000; Wallsend, 21,000.

Mid-day Delivery of Letters at Aghnacliffe.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he could arrange for a mid-day delivery of letters to Aghnacliffe by bicycle from Granard or Ballinalee.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I will have inquiry made on the subject, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Telephone Agreement—Opportunity for Discussion in the House.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can undertake not to appoint the Select Committee upon the Telephone Agreement without giving the House an opportunity of discussing the matter.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I venture to think that a thorough examination of the Telephone Agreement can best be secured by referring it at once to a Select Committee. If hon. Members insist upon raising a discussion upon that reference, I fear that the appointment of the Committee will inevitably be delayed.

Privacy of Telegrams.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that on 4th March a telegram was handed in at Clones Rail telegraph office in connection with the Postal Telegraph Conference at Dublin; that the supervising officer drew the attention of the postmaster to the contents of the message; and that the latter gentleman has caused inquiries to be made into the meaning of the message and the person who despatched it; and, if so, whether he can state what were the reasons for this action; whether such action is warranted by any rule of the service; and whether officials connected with service organisations are liable to be called to explain to their superiors their action in using the public telegraph service for the purpose of legitimate business.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The circumstance has not come under my notice, but I will inquire about it.

Compensation for Auxiliary Postman Webb.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that James Webb, auxiliary postman, of Levenshulme, Manchester, on 7th December, 1903, when on duty, met with an accident which has permanently incapacitated him for active labour; that the man has done no work since the accident; that the only compensation awarded Webb has been a compassionate gratuity of £9 11s. 5d.; and, if so, whether, under the exceptional circumstances, some further grant will be made to Webb.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Webb's capacity to contribute to his own support was materially impaired as the result of an accident. The whole of the circumstances were represented to the Treasury before the award of a gratuity was made, and I regret very much that there are no grounds on which I can obtain a further grant for him from public funds.

Somaliland.

Mr. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government propose to secede any further portion of British Somaliland; and, if so, to what Power; what is the area of British Somaliland evacuated by the adoption of the policy now announced.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) No cession of any part of the protectorate is contemplated.

Accommodation for Women Students in Training Colleges.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether vacant places in training colleges for women students in September next are correctly stated amounting to 3,141, being 1,941 and 1,200 in residential and day colleges respectively; whether he is aware that, of the 4,245 women reaching the qualifying standard for admission, 1,875 candidates are returned in the recent scholarship list as not desirous of entering any college; and whether there is any probability of a shortage of accommodation for women students.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The 1,877 candidates to whom the hon. Member refers cannot be described as not desirous of entering any college; they have merely not informed the Board whether they desire to enter a training college or not. They were not compelled to supply this information, and the failure to supply it does not warrant the inference which the Question suggests. The Board has further no information as to the number of women desirous of entering a college who have qualified by some means other than that of passing the last King's scholarship examination. In the absence of such information, it is impossible to say for certain whether there will be a deficiency of accommodation for women students in September next, though such a deficiency is extremely probable.

Companies and the Medical and Dental Acts.

SIR JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that evasions of the Medical Acts and the Dental Acts to the detriment of the public have been effected under the provisions of the Companies Acts: and, if so, whether he proposes to initiate legislation to preclude the possibility of such evasions being effected in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I am aware of the cases, recently before the Courts, to which the hon. Member refers. I am not in a position to make any statement as to legislation, but I may say that the Lord President of the Council has been in communication with the General Medical Council and the Board of Trade on the subject of companies carrying on business as doctors and dentists; and the Board of Trade are, I understand, obtaining the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown on the question of the registration of such companies under the Companies Acts.

Report upon Railway Accidents.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade when the General Report upon the Accidents on the Railways of the United Kingdom for 1904 will be in the hands of Members, and whether he will give the following figures for 1904: From train accidents—passengers killed and injured respectively; railway servants killed and injured respectively; train mileage; from movement of trains and vehicles, exclusive of train accidents—passengers killed and injured respectively; railway servants killed and injured respectively; number of servants exposed to danger from movement of railway vehicles.

(*Answered by Mr. Bonar Law.*) The General Report on Railway Accidents for 1904 will not in the ordinary course be issued for some little time, but the Returns for the three months ended 31st December last are now with the printers, and will shortly be issued. During the year 1904 there were six passengers and seven railway servants killed, and 533 passengers and 114 servants injured in train accidents. In other accidents caused by the movement of trains and railway vehicles 109 passengers and 403 servants were killed, and 2,135 passengers and 3,768 servants were injured. These figures may be subject to some slight alterations before the Returns are published but are substantially correct. The Board of Trade cannot yet give the train mileage for 1904, or the number of servants exposed to danger from the movement of railway vehicles.

Gibraltar Harbour Works.

MR. BILL (Staffordshire, Leek): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty have taken into consideration the report of Admiral Rawson, dated 30th March, 1901, with reference to the harbour works of Gibraltar; and whether it is their intention to carry that report into effect, so far as regards the provision of a dock on the east side of the rock.

(*Answered by Mr. Arthur Lee.*) The reply to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. As regards the latter part of the Question, the Board of Admiralty decided, after full consideration of the report referred to, and of the further report by Captain T. H. Tizard, C.B., F.R.S., R.N., and Mr. William Shield, M.I.C.E., F.R.S.E., that the advantages to be gained by the construction of a dock and harbour on the eastern side of the rock were not sufficient to justify the expense that would thereby be incurred.

Longford Police Force.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he will state what is the present strength of the police force in county Longford; by how many men it has been reduced since 1st November, 1903; and how many existing barracks are to be closed in consequence.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) The present strength of the county force is one county inspector, three district inspectors, and 120 men, a reduction of nine as compared with the numbers on 1st November, 1903. One station has been disestablished.

Scheme for Purchase of Newtownforbes and Drumlish.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he will direct that the Local Government Board Engineering Inspector will hold a second sitting in connection with the proposed scheme to purchase the villages of Newtownforbes and Drumlish, under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, with a view to getting over certain difficulties that arose at the last inquiry.

(*Answered by Mr. Atkinson.*) It will be necessary for the Board's Engineering Inspector to make a further inspection of the houses included in the proposed scheme before a loan can be sanctioned by the Board in this case.

Irish Education—Amalgamation of Boys and Girls Schools.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the dissatisfaction in regard to the introduction of the new rule in boys schools, he will consult with the National Commissioners of Education as to the advisability of the amalgamation of boys and girls schools where work goes on under one roof, and inaugurate a separate infant department for both sexes up to eight, the head mistress holding her salary and put in charge of the latter department.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The Question, presumably, refers to Rule 127 (b). If so, I would ask the hon. Member to defer the Question until Monday next.

Cost of Moving Troops from Belfast to Newry.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the approximate cost incurred by railing the troops in two half battalions to and from Newry, together with the cost of their field training in Newry.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) My hon. friend apparently refers to the move of the 1st Battalion King's Own Scottish Borderers from Belfast to Newry, which took place in order to make room for another regiment returning home from South Africa. Half the battalion was moved in February, 1904, and half in May, at a cost of about £40 each move. The battalion did not return from Newry to Belfast. The cost of the field training at Newry cannot be calculated without considerable labour.

Field Guns for 4th West York Volunteer Artillery.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state when the field guns promised four years ago to the 4th West York Volunteer Artillery will be delivered.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) No field guns are at present available for issue to this corps; but the question of the future armament of Volunteer Artillery corps is under consideration.

Pay of Private Soldiers.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the yearly rate of increase of pay for men who extend after three years colour service; and at what period, and the amount of the maximum daily pay that can be obtained by a private soldier.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The maximum daily pay that can be obtained by a private of infantry is 2s., attainable after five years service, as follows:—From attestation, 1s.; after six months service, if efficient and 19 years of age, 1s. 5d.; after two years service, if extending colour service to eight years, 1s. 9d.; after two years, if extending, on becoming a second-class shot, 1s. 11d.; after five years service, if a second-class shot, 2s.

Increase of Army Estimates

Mr. LAMBERT: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the loans which entail an increase of £370,000 on the Army Estimates.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) This increase arises from sums of £1,875,000 advanced in 1904 under the Military Works Acts, and of £2,625,000 advanced under the Capital Expenditure (Money) Act of 1904 for the purposes of the Military Works Acts.

Volunteer Force—Allowances and Proposed Changes.

Mr. LAMBERT: To ask the Secretary of State of War what are the present allowances to Volunteers; and will he compare them with the changes that would be allowed if the force were reduced to 200,000 men.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) A description of the present allowances to Volunteers will be found in paragraphs 510 and 534 of the Volunteer Regulations. I am not prepared to make any further statement regarding changes that can only be carried into effect under conditions which are not at present realised.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Whale Island—Officers' Accommodation.

Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how soon the new accommodation for officers undergoing training at Whale Island will be completed.

The CIVIL LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham): It is expected that this accommodation will be completed by the end of August next.

Brigade of Guards—Deficiency of Officers

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Brigade of Guards is short by thirty to forty of its full complement of officers; has any proposal been before the authorities to admit young officers on probation to fill up these vacancies without the usual entrance examination or military training; if so, on what reasons was that proposal based; and whether an undertaking will be given that officers shall not enter the Brigade of Guards in a manner different from the way in which other branches of the Army are entered.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): The shortage of officers in the Foot Guards is forty-four. This deficiency is very serious and is receiving the careful consideration of the Army Council. I am not at present in a position to give the hon. Member any further information on the subject.

London's Defence

*Mr. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War who was responsible for ordering the construction of military earthworks on the Surrey Hills; for what purpose they were constructed; what has been the total expenditure upon them to date; whether the construction is still in progress; and, if not, who is responsible for ordering the discontinuance of the work.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is presumed that the hon. Member refers to the mobilisation centres round London, some of which are in the form of redoubts. The responsibility for the initiation of these works, in 1889, rests with Mr. Stanhope, who was then Secretary of State for War, and the reasons for them are fully given in his speech on the introduction of the Army Estimates on March 11th, 1889. The total expenditure on the whole works amounted to £160,700, and all expenditure has been completed.

Crimean Veterans—Ex-Sergeant Martin's Claim.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has received on behalf of ex-Sergeant Martin, of the Land Transport Corps, a solemn declaration, together with medical certificates, to prove that Martin has been for years, and is now, suffering from a shattered leg, due to the splinter of a shell during the Crimean War; and whether, in view of this man's age and circumstances, he will consider the advisability of increasing his present pension of ninepence per day.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: This man's case has already been very carefully investigated. As there is no corroborative evidence either in this man's possession or in official records of his having been wounded or treated in hospital during the few months which he served in the Crimea, it is not possible to grant him the benefit of a higher rate of pension.

Mr. SLOAN: May I ask whether, in view of the fact that this man is seventy-five years old and quite destitute, cannot the right hon. Gentleman reconsider his case?

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am afraid that the fact of age is not relevant. The allegations of the man as to his service cannot be substantiated.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): A warning to Irishmen to keep away from the British Army.

Army Wastages.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is satisfied that full inquiry has been made into each of the cases mentioned in pages 112 to 125, inclusive, and page 242 of the Appropriation Account, 1903–4 [Command 45], under which a sum of £201,815 6s. 3d. has had to be written off as irrecoverable on account of losses consequent on fraud or otherwise during the war in South Africa.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War why it was not ascertained before the 59,000 war medals, afterwards returned to the Mint and broken up, were struck for issue to natives in South Africa after the war, that the issue of these medals would involve, as stated on page 227 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General [Command 45] racial objections.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state where the ammunition referred to in the Ordinance Store Accounts Return from South Africa was manufactured, of which over 50,000,000 rounds were received in an imperfect or doubtful condition; and what steps have been taken in connection with this ammunition; and what is its total value.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: These three Questions deal with matter arising from the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General on the accounts for 1903–4. These matters will come before the Public Accounts Committee and I am not, therefore, prepared to discuss them at the present time.

Dr. MACNAMARA: May I ask whether the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General is not now before Parliament, and whether the final Report of the Public Accounts Committee, which we await, was not issued last year after Parliament rose?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not dispute the facts. But I say it is in accordance with precedent for these matters to be dealt with by a Committee of the House, and I must reserve anything I have to say upon them.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): Is not the War Office itself going to investigate these matters?

MR ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, the War Office has already investigated them. The Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General, with the complaints renewed, was received only a few days ago, but long anterior to that the War Office instituted an investigation.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will there be an opportunity of discussing the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General this session.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I cannot give a more precise Answer. I am simply following the course dictated by precedent and the one I believe to be most acceptable to the House and most respectful to the House. The Public Accounts Committee investigated these matters, and they are now *sub judice.* It would be very wrong on my part to withdraw from the consideration of the Public Accounts Committee matters which are definitely referred to them by the custom and practice of the House.

DR. MACNAMARA: May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it will be in order for me to ask the Prime Minister the Question which the Secretary of State says he cannot answer—whether any opportunity will be given to the House of discussing the finding of the Public Accounts Committee on the Report.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member asked the Prime Minister that Question yesterday.

DR. MACNAMARA: With great respect, no, Sir. What I asked was whether the Prime Minister would give facilities for the discussion of the notice of Motion on the Paper.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Question is practically the same.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is it not a fact that seven months elapsed before there was any reply——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice must be given of any further Question. The right hon. Gentleman has stated, in reply to the Question on the Paper, he does not consider that under the circumstances he is justified in saying anything further. The hon. Member is not entitled to argue upon it.

Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what were the strong Departmental reasons on which the Army Council decided to reduce the establishment of the small arms factory at Sparkbrook; by whom was the decision reversed; and was the Army Council consulted before its reversal.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Army Council's decision was based solely upon grounds of economy. The decision has not been reversed; but further action has been temporarily suspended pending the determination of a larger question which was indicated in an Answer given by the Prime Minister to the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield on February 27th.†

MR. WHITLEY: My last Question has not been answered. Was the Army Council consulted?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Army Council was, of course, consulted. I have already informed the hon. Member that there was no reversal, and that under the circumstances I have described there was a postponement.

MR. WHITLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman grant the Return on the Paper relating to this matter and explaining the negotiations that have taken place?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice must be given of that Question.

The Return referred to is as follows:—Small Arms Department (Sparkbrook). Address for Return of (1) the Minute of the Army Council relating to the reduction of the establishment at Sparkbrook; (2) the communications between the hon. Member for the Bordesley Division and the Secretary of State for War relating to the same; (3) the communications between the hon. Member for West Birmingham and the First Lord of the Treasury relating to the same.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1338.

Defence of Halifax and Esquimalt.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the question of the responsibility and the cost of the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt has been the subject of correspondence between the Imperial and the Dominion Governments; and, if so, by what Department of the Imperial Government has that correspondence been conducted.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I have been in correspondence with the Governor-General of Canada on the subject referred to by the hon. Member, and, as I stated in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Gloucester on the 2nd instant,† the correspondence will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it is complete.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): Which Government now bears the cost and responsibility of these defences?

MR. LYTTELTON: The Home Government.

Coolie Wages in the Transvaal Mines.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, having regard to the fact that the minimum wage of the Chinese coolie is at the rate of one shilling a day, he proposes to take any steps to carry out the pledge he gave the House on June 22nd,‡ 1904, to the effect that the minimum wage of the Chinese coolie would be increased from thirty shillings to forty-five shillings a month after the first six months, if it should appear that the Chinese coolie was in any way under-cutting the Kaffir labourer in the mines.

MR. LYTTELTON: I would refer the hon. Member to the provision in the contract for an increase in the minimum wage from thirty shillings to forty-five shillings after six months in certain circumstances, which he will find at page 10 of Cd. 2183.

DR. MACNAMARA: Is it proposed to take any steps in connection with this pledge?

MR. LYTTELTON: I keep myself constantly informed on the matter.

Cost of the Indian Garrison in Somaliland.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will give the estimated cost per annum of the Indian troops which it is proposed to leave as a garrison in the interior of Somaliland; and whether all the charges incurred in the transport of these troops, together with the current rates of pay, allowances for foreign service, and debits due to pension accounts arising out of their employment in Somaliland, will be borne by the British Treasury.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The estimated cost for one year of the Indian troops now in Somaliland is £53,063, including initial and terminal charges as well as those mentioned by the hon. Member. All these charges will be borne by Imperial funds.

Maritime States—Proposed Unification of Collision and Salvage Laws.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has yet received from the British Minister at Brussels a report of the proceedings of the International Diplomatic Conference held at that city in February last to consider the proposed unification of the laws of the various Maritime States with respect to collision and salvage; and whether the draft treaties adopted by the Conference, when communicated, will receive the consideration of His Majesty's Government.

EARL PERCY: A full report has not yet been received. The Answer to the last paragraph is in the affirmative.

---

† See page 182.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 821.

Turkish Customs Duties and Macedonian Reforms.

Mr. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government has assented to the increase of the *ad valorem* Customs duty proposed by the Porte in consideration of the surplus being applied to the execution of reforms in Macedonia; if so, what further reforms, if any, have the Government stipulated for as a condition of their assent; and what security is there that she money obtained will actually be applied to the execution of reforms.

Earl PERCY: His Majesty's Government have not yet given their assent to the proposed increase. The conditions on which assent could be given are still under their consideration and that of the other Powers.

Somaliland—The Defence of the Tribes.

*Mr. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any, and, if so, how many, British officers are to be appointed for the organisation and defence of the tribes in the Somaliland Protectorate with whom His Majesty's Government have entered into treaties of protection.

Earl PERCY: There is no present intention of increasing the staff of British officers for the special purpose referred to.

*Mr. LYELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether rifles are being supplied gratis to the protected tribes of Somaliland, and, if so, what description of rifles, and how many it is proposed to issue.

Earl PERCY: I think the hon. Member will see on reflection that it is not desirable at the present juncture that a wider publicity than necessary should be given to the details for which he asks.

*Mr. LYELL: But the noble Lord, in describing this altered policy, said these tribes were to be armed with rifles. Surely it is within the competence of this House to inquire as to the nature of the rifle to be provided?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Protected Tribes in Somaliland.

*Mr. LYELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it has been explained to the protected tribes of Somaliland that His Majesty's Government do not repudiate the general obligations into which they have entered with the tribes, but that the particular manner in which they interpreted these obligations depended on circumstances.

Earl PERCY: His Majesty's Government have instructed their Commissioner to explain to the tribes that they are expected to take advantage of the present opportunity to organise for their own protection, and that if they do not fulfil their engagements towards this country we shall consider ourselves at liberty to reconsider our relations with them.

*Mr. LYELL: What is the engagement of these tribes towards this country?

Earl PERCY: Chiefly to keep the roads into the interior open.

*Mr. LYELL: On what occasion have they failed to do that?

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Has it been definitely decided to arm these tribes?

Earl PERCY: Yes, Sir, it has been decided to issue a limited number of rifles to certain specially selected tribes.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: How many?

Earl PERCY: I do not think it is advisable in the public interest to give that information.

Post Office Savings Bank and the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt.

Dr. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the fact that the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt have not been summoned to meet on the business of the Post Office Savings Bank Fund since the establishment of the bank in 1861, he will now cause the Commissioners to be summoned for the purpose of taking their opinion as to the propriety of repealing so much of the Savings Bank Act, 1904, as relates to the release of the Postmaster-General and the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt from the obligation of preparing balance-sheets of the Post Office Savings Bank and the Trustee Savings Banks respectively; and as to the desirability of informing the Treasury of the deficiency in the assets of the Post Office Savings Bank (present amount unknown, but £11,033,000 on December 31st, 1903), in order that such deficiency may be issued out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or out of the growing produce thereof, in accordance with the provisions of 24 and 25 Vict., c. 14, s. 6.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): No, Sir. I see no reason for taking the unprecedented course proposed in the Question.

Criminal Statistics.

Mr. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the reason why the Criminal Statistics for 1903 were not published till December, 1904; and will he take steps to prevent such long delay in the corresponding publication for 1904.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): The hon. Member seems to be under a misapprehension. The Criminal Statistics for 1903, so far from being delayed, appeared at an earlier date than the statistics for any previous year since they assumed their present form. The Returns from which the statistics are compiled are not completely available until the middle of the year following, and the work of compilation and preparation of the introduction is extremely heavy. Perhaps I may add that the English statistics of crime are issued much earlier than those of most of the principal foreign countries.

Island of Lewis Postal Arrangements.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that letters reaching Stornoway, Island of Lewis, on Tuesday forenoon are not delivered in the Bernera district of the island until Saturday afternoon; and, as this delay causes inconvenience to a number of inhabitants, will arrangements be made to provide Bernera with a mail three times a week instead of only twice a week, as at present.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I find that since the question of the postal service at Bernera was last considered, a new public ferry has been established between Callanish and Miawaig and that it is now practicable to afford a service three times a week at Bernera. I have had pleasure, therefore, in giving instructions for carrying out that improvement.

Learners in the Post Office.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the number of learners appointed to post offices in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively for the years 1902, 1903, and 1904, under open competition and under a qualifying examination on the nomination of the local postmaster respectively.

Lord STANLEY: I will furnish the hon. Member with a statement giving the information asked for, which could not conveniently be given in an Answer in the House.

North Eastern Railway—Electrification Fatalities.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade, having regard to the fact that the North Eastern Railway Company have electrified a portion of their system without obtaining specific statutory powers, will he state whether he proposes to notify other railway companies in the United Kingdom of the irregularity of such a course; will he state how many miles of the North Eastern system have been electrified, on what date the system came into force, the number of accidents resulting therefrom, and the number of persons besides Alice Maughan who have lost their lives through contact with unprotected rails; whether compensation has been granted in the case of each accident; and whether the Board of

Trade inspectors are now quite satisfied that the rails are sufficiently protected.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BONAR LAW, Glasgow, Blackfriars): The Board of Trade are not prepared to say that the North Eastern has been guilty of any irregularity, and see no necessity, therefore, to call the attention of the companies generally to the course adopted by that railway. I understand that the length of that company's line which has been electrically equipped is thirty-three miles, and that electrical working was begun towards the end of last March. Up to the present time twenty-eight accidents have occurred from the use of electrical power on this railway; this number includes four fatal accidents, in addition to that mentioned by the hon. Member, resulting from contact with the electrically charged rail. The Board of Trade are not aware whether compensation has been paid by the railway company in each case. An inquiry has been held into the accident to Alice Maughan, but the Board of Trade have not yet received the inspecting officer's report. The railway company has carried out the recommendations of the inspecting officers in so far as they have been made at present.

St. Joseph's School, Nymphsfield.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that there are fifty children in attendance at St. Joseph's School, Nymphsfield, whilst the attendance at the Church school is only nineteen; and whether, in view of the fact that St. Joseph's School was fulfilling all the requirements and conditions of a public elementary school before the Act of 1902 came into operation, he can state in what respect it is now held not to fulfil those conditions.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The St. Joseph's School, Nymphsfield, has never been recognised as a public elementary school. The Board have very carefully considered the circumstances under which application for recognition was made. In arriving at their decision they have proceeded in strict accordance with the requirements of Section 8 of the Act of 1902.

Buckingham Palace Improvement Works.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether the circle, of which the architectural design at Buckingham Gate forms an arc, is to be completed.

*LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The reply is in the negative.

COLONEL LEGGE: Then if the circle is not to be completed is it to be squared?

[No Answer was returned.]

Parliament Buildings—Discomfort caused to Members.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he is aware of the discomfort experienced by Members, especially in hot weather, crowded in the division lobbies after the outer doors of the Chamber have been locked; and whether he can see his way to recommending the appointment of a Committee to consider and report on suggestions for new exits to be used as soon as the outer doors are locked.

*LORD BALCARRES: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The First Commissioner is unable to give any reply to the second paragraph; it appears to him to be a matter for the House. My hon. and gallant friend's suggestions might be discussed on the Estimate for Houses of Parliament Buildings.

Ventilation of the Ladies' Gallery.

COLONEL WELBY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he is aware of the need for ventilation experienced in the Ladies' Gallery, especially when many are in it in hot weather; whether he will consider the possibility of piercing a window in the end wall to open to the outer air.

*Lord BALCARRES: The ventilation of the Ladies' Gallery is part of the general scheme for the ventilation of the Chamber and its precincts; the works incidental to this are not yet completed. It is hoped that they will remove the defects which now exist, but until these works are finished, and tested during the Easter recess, it is impossible to give any undertaking as to making a window.

Mr. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of removing the grating?

[No Answer was returned.]

Railway Directors on Select Committees.

*Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Bath, as Chairman of the Committee of Selection, whether his Committee was aware, when appointing the hon. Member for Wandsworth as Chairman of a Committee to consider Group 1 of Railway Bills, that the hon. Member for Wandsworth is Chairman of the South Indian Railway Company; whether it is the usual practice of the Committee of Selection to appoint railway directors to act on Committees on Railway Bills; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter; and, if so, what action.

Mr. WODEHOUSE (Bath): I was not aware that the hon. Member for Wandsworth was Chairman of the South Indian Railway Company when he was appointed Chairman of the Committee to consider Group 1 of Railway Bills. As regards the question whether it is the usual practice of the Committee to appoint railway directors to act on Committees on Railway Bills, I would observe that the ordinary declaration of a Member serving on a Committee on a private Bill is that his constituents have no local interest in the Bill and that he himself has no personal interest in it. I view these conditions as sufficient safeguard against irregular practices, and I am of opinion that the fact that the hon. Member for Wandsworth is Chairman of an Indian railway company should not disqualify him from serving on a Committee on an English Railway Bill. I am therefore not prepared to take action on that ground.

*Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the hon. Member for Wandsworth is not only Chairman of an Indian railway company but Chairman of a second railway company, and the London agent of a third? [Cries of "Order!"] I would also ask whether, in view of the fact that there are no less than seventy-six railway directors in this House——["Order, order!"]

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is going beyond his Question. The hon. Member for Bath is entitled to notice of any such Question as that.

*Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I recognise that, Sir, but in view of the fact that the Committee is probably to meet tomorrow, I ask whether the hon. Member is aware that when the Great Southern and Western Amalgamation Bill was to be considered the hon. Member for Wandsworth was nominated as Chairman of the Committee to which the Bill was referred, and that the Committee rejected him as Chairman on the ground, amongst others, that he was Chairman of an Indian railway company.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is going beyond his licence. He is now proceeding to enter into arguments why the hon. Member for Wandsworth should not be appointed.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Move the adjournment.

*Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: My object is to ask the Chairman of the Committee of Selection, for the reasons I have advanced, if he will not reconsider the matter.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member can ask whether the Chairman, if fresh facts are put before him, will again consider the matter, but he is not entitled to proceed to narrate those fresh facts.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask the hon. Member whether it is the usual practice of the Committee of

Selection to appoint railway directors to act on Committees on Railway Bills?

MR. WODEHOUSE: I am not aware that it is the usual practice.

*MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is it usual to appoint a London agent?

[No Answer was returned.]

*MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN, later, asked whether the hon. Member for Wandsworth, under the circumstances, intended to serve as Chairman of the Committee on Railway Bills?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to put a Question to a private Member on a matter which is not on the Order Paper.

*MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: It relates to the proceedings of the House, and I warned the hon. Gentleman of my intended action four days ago.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Question in these terms is irregular.

*MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: The hon. Gentleman is willing to answer it, I think. I thought the hon. Member might as well answer the Question to-day as to-morrow. I do not intend to drop it. I beg to give notice that I will ask my hon. friend the Member for South Westmeath and other Members of this Select Committee if, under the circumstances, they are willing to serve under the Chairmanship of the hon. Member for Wandsworth.

Ness Harbour.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate, having regard to the fact that the harbour at Ness, Island of Lewis, is choked with sand, will he state whether it is proposed to take any action to render it of service to the fishermen of the district.

*THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgeton): I have nothing to add to the reply to a similar Question given by Mr. Graham Murray on February 17th[†] last year.

MR. WEIR: Then I take it that this harbour is to remain choked up, and to be absolutely useless for all time.

Island of Lewis—Health Officer.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether he is aware that, at a recent meeting of the Lewis District Committee, it was proposed that a medical officer of health should be appointed for the Island of Lewis; and, in the event of effect being given to the suggestion, will arrangements be made for the new officer to be responsible to the Local Government Board direct and not to the medical officer of health for the county.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The Board have no information of the meeting referred to and are at present awaiting the action of the district committee, with whom any arrangements regarding the appointment and its conditions primarily rest. I may further refer the hon. Member to the Answer I gave on February 27th,[‡] 1905.

Cahirciveen River Navigation.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether, seeing that the Congested Districts Board are now the constituted harbour authority of the estuary of the Cahirciveen River, they will take steps to erect perches on Leck-a-vallig and East Ballycarberry reef of rocks, so as to make the river navigable and safe for fishing and other boats.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The Congested Districts Board are recognised as a lighthouse authority for erecting and maintaining lights. The Board have undertaken to erect perches at the two places named, the county contributing a portion of the cost.

Insurance of Irish Fishing Boats.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board has come to a decision with reference to the scheme for the insurance of large fishing boats; and, if so, whether he can state the particulars of the scheme.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, cxxx., 6.

[‡] See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1321.

Mr. ATKINSON: Yes, Sir; arrangements have been completed for putting this scheme into operation. I have communicated printed particulars of the scheme to the hon. Member.

Achill Island Pier.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland will he state the date on which the survey was made for the timber-pile extension of the pier at Darby's Point, Achill Island, and by whom it was made.

Mr. ATKINSON: The survey was made by the engineer's foreman on various dates between January 17th and February 7th. The engineer's assistant also inspected the place on January 23rd.

Dr. AMBROSE: I had a letter from the Congested Districts Board on March 7th saying their surveyor had not been there.

Catholic Demonstration in Armagh.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether police facilities will be given to the Clovenden, Loughgall (county Armagh) band to traverse the by-road leading to the county road, seeing that the only house on the by-road is that of the Catholic clergyman, and that there is no danger of a breach of the peace.

Mr. ATKINSON: The police are of opinion that any attempt on the part of the band to proceed along the by-road in question would be calculated to provoke serious rioting and disturbance of the public peace. There is an alternative route by which the band has proceeded for some years past, and which is equally convenient. Under the circumstances the Government are unable to entertain the suggestion that the band should be allowed to traverse the road to which reference is made.

Mr. MACVEAGH: How could a disturbance occur along a road in which there is only one house?

Mr. ATKINSON: It might arise from the assembling of a large number of people.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Would not the better way to preserve the peace be to prevent people coming into the district at all?

[No Answer was returned.]

Dr. Jennings' Farm at Skibbereen.

Mr. EDWARD BARRY (Cork County, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that in a recent decision of the Sub-Commission, presided over by Mr. Crean, 25 per cent. was added to his value of a farm held by Dr. Jennings in the neighbourhood of Skibbereen on account of its proximity to the town; and, if so, whether he will state the grounds of proximity on which this decision was based.

Mr. ATKINSON: I have no information in this matter. Under the 38th Section of the Irish Land Act, 1903, any person aggrieved by an Order made under the Land Law Acts by a Sub-Commission may apply for a re-hearing to the Land Commission, and the Land Commission may confirm, modify, or reverse such Order.

Irish Agricultural and Technical Instructors.

Mr. HUGH LAW: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether the Department of Agriculture have in any instances sanctioned the appointment by the council of any county of natives of such county as male or female agricultural or technical instructors; and, if so, if he can explain why the Department has refused to sanction such appointments when made by the County Council of Donegal.

Mr. ATKINSON: Before the Department found it necessary to make the rule in question in 1903, certain instructors had been appointed in the counties of which they are natives; but there has been no departure from the rule since it was first inserted in the Department's schemes. The rule specially applies to agricultural schemes, and it was only adopted when the need for it had been demonstrated by experience.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a fully qualified person from Donegal was rejected simply because she was a native of the county and knew the locality?

MR. HUGH LAW: And is the right hon. Gentleman also aware that a fully qualified person who was thus rejected had her appointment approved on several occasions by the county council?

MR. ATKINSON: If so, it was done under the rule I have mentioned.

Dungloe (Donegal) Evicted Tenant.

MR. HUGH LAW: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any steps to secure the reinstatement of Mr. George Ward, of Tuberheen, Dungloe, county Donegal, in the holding from which he was evicted; or, failing such reinstatement, they can hold out any prospect of settling him in another holding on any unoccupied lands in the neighbourhood.

MR. ATKINSON: The evicted holding is in the occupation of a new tenant. Ward has been so informed, and also that his application for reinstatement will be considered by the Commissioners should they acquire untenanted lands in the neighbourhood.

Irish Prison Medical Officers.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on what grounds the practice has been adopted in recent years of appointing temporary medical officers to Irish prisons, instead of appointing permanent medical officers as was formerly the practice.

MR. ATKINSON: The arrangement referred to has been adopted in the Irish prison service in order to assimilate the system to that previously existing in the Scotch service. The question of pensions is not affected, as these officers did not devote their whole time to the service before the introduction of the change and consequently were not eligible for pensions.

De La Salla College.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH (Leitrim, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Sligo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many extra King's scholars were admitted into De La Salla (Carysfort Park, Blackrock) during session 1904–5, owing to the £5,000 voted out of Development Grant last year.

MR. ATKINSON: The certificate of this college has not been increased during the current session. Application was made by the principal of the college for an enlarged certificate, but the reports made to the Commissioners of National Education on the condition of the college by their chief inspectors were of such an unsatisfactory character as to preclude the Commissioners from recommending the application for sanction.

Railway Delays—Limerick Butter Case.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a complaint as to a delay in the transit of butter, made by a Limerick merchant, on November 14th last, to the Irish Department of Agriculture was not answered until the 7th of this month; will he inquire into the cause of the delay, and take measures to prevent a recurrence of such delay in future.

MR. ATKINSON: The complaint referred to was made to the Department on November 14th, and on the following day the Irish railway company concerned was communicated with. The Department was not placed in possession of the final information given by the English companies until the third instant, and on the 7th the result of the inquiry was communicated to the complainant. The Department are, therefore, in no way responsible for any delay that may have occurred.

Irish Jury Laws.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received the resolution unanimously adopted by the Banbridge (county Down) Urban District

Council calling for an amendment of the jurors laws in Ireland and the payment of jurors; and whether the Government intend to introduce legislation on this subject.

MR. ATKINSON: The resolution has been received. The reply to the second inquiry is in the negative.

Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, as the Royal Irish Constabulary has been reduced by 751 men and only two officers, and those district inspectors representing 96 men, he will see that a proportionate reduction is made in the number of officers, the cost to the country of a district inspector being five times, and of a county inspector ten times, that of an ordinary constable.

MR. ATKINSON: The published Estimate for the Royal Irish Constabulary shows the number in each of the ranks mentioned for which provision is proposed in the next, as compared with the current, financial year. Owing to the statutory rights of county and district inspectors the scheme of reduction cannot have a proportionately large effect on them as on the rank and file.

Irish Department of Agriculture—Official Salaries.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Treasury sanction was obtained for the increase of the maximum salary of the chief clerk of the Department of Agriculture from £700 to £850 per annum; and is he aware that while the Treasury sanction has been obtained for this and other increases of salary the Department has made unsuccessful recommendations to the Treasury for increases amounting to less than 1s. per week in the salaries of men with service under the Crown of from ten to thirteen years, whose pay is approximately £95 a year; and whether he will see that no further increase in the chief clerk's salary is proposed to the detriment of the humbler officials and until their claims have been suitably dealt with.

MR. ATKINSON: The reply to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. There is no analogy between the case of an administrative officer of the position and standing of the chief clerk, who has completed over thirty-seven years service, and the cases of the junior clerks referred to in the Question. The latter are on the scale of salary determined by the Treasury for the grade of the service to which they belong.

Kenmare Fever Case—Rev. Mr. Duggan's Action.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, with reference to the application of the rural district councillors of Kenmare for an inquiry into the death of a fever patient named Cotter, and to the charges made against the Rev. Mr. Duggan for attending the patient, although he was not a qualified medical man, he will state what steps can be taken to prevent such practices in the future; and whether, seeing that the district was rendered liable to an outbreak of fever through the action of a gentleman not medically qualified, he will see that full inquiry is made into the whole circumstances of this case.

MR. ATKINSON: I stated in answer to the hon. Member's previous Question of Thursday last† that upon the information before the Local Government Board, the reverend gentleman had not contravened the law. The Board are not aware that there are any grounds for the statement in the second part of the Question. No cases of fever have been reported recently from this district other than that of the man Cotter.

MR. BOLAND: What steps can be taken to prevent unqualified men in a district treating cases wrongfully, thereby creating danger of the spread of infection?

MR. ATKINSON: None can be taken by the Local Government Board if the law is not broken.

---

† See page 928.

MR. BOLAND: Can the Crown take steps?

MR. ATKINSON: There is no crime alleged in this case.

Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland and the Limerick Technical Classes.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the action of the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland in refusing to register the classes established by the Limerick Technical Education Committee, although repeatedly appealed to by the committee, who were willing to conform to any rules they would wish to lay down; and whether, seeing that expense has been incurred both in the matter of teaching staff and laboratory, he will ask the Pharmaceutical Society to reconsider their decision.

MR. ATKINSON: My attention has not been directed to the matters alleged in the Question, nor has the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction been invited to intervene in the case.

Distress in the West of Ireland.

MR. O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg, in accordance with private notice, to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can make any general statement as to the measures now in force for the relief of distress in the West of Ireland, giving, amongst other particulars, the names of counties which have adopted Clause 13 of the Local Government Act; the names of unions which have adopted Clause 13; the number and nature of the works sanctioned in each union which has adopted Clause 13, and the number sanctioned for employment in each electoral division; and the conditions under which the guardians have been allowed to employ men on works sanctioned under Clause 13.

MR. ATKINSON: The counties which have adopted Clause 13 are Galway, Mayo, and Cavan. The unions which have adopted the clause are Bawnboy, county Cavan; Oughterard, Galway, Clifden, county Galway; Swineford, Westport and Belmullet, county Mayo. The number of divisions for which works have been started is as follows:—In Bawnboy Union, 6; in Oughterard Union, 11; in Clifden Union, 9; in Galway Union, not yet stated; in Swineford Union, 15; in Westport Union, 6; in Belmullet Union, 15; The works consist of road construction and repairs, road fencing, clearing drains, etc. The numbers relieved by the operation of Section 13, apart from ordinary outdoor relief, according to the returns received last week were, in Bawnboy Union, 1,099 persons; Belmullet Union, 1,148 persons; Oughterard Union, 1,781 persons. Works were only opened recently in Swineford and Clifden Unions, and information of the numbers relieved has not yet been received. The schemes proposed in Galway Union have not so far been submitted to the Local Government Board. In reply to the concluding inquiry, each person employed is required to work for eight hours daily. The daily wage does not exceed one shilling, except in cases of very large families.

Galway Mill-Stream.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the total amount of expenditure by the Board of Works on the cleaning of the mill-stream at Galway.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The Board of Works have expended nothing on the cleaning of the mill-stream at Galway, the care of which is vested in trustees by the Act 41 and 42 Vic., cap. 212.

Railway Delays—Limerick Complaint.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to a complaint made by Mr. Robert Gibson, butter merchant, Limerick, as to a delay of nine days in the delivery of a box of butter sent from Limerick to Newport, Essex, by passenger train, on which the highest rate is paid; and, if so, whether he will take steps to insist on the railway companies insuring prompt delivery so that Irish produce will have a fair chance of competing with foreign produce.

Mr. BONAR LAW: No complaint has been received by the Board of Trade of the delay of the consignment of butter referred to, but they have communicated with the Great Southern and Western Railway Company on the subject of the hon. Member's Question, and learn that the delay was due to the consignment having been by mistake conveyed in the first instance to a place named Newport other than that for which it was intended.

Dublin to North of Ireland Mail.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the latest hour for posting letters at the General Post Office, Dublin, for the North of Ireland is 6.40 p.m., and with a late fee 7.40 p.m.; and, if so, whether, in view of the inconvenience caused to traders both in Dublin and the North of Ireland, he will take steps to have an alteration made in the present arrangement.

Lord STANLEY: The latest hour for posting letters at the General Post Office, Dublin, for the night mail despatch to the North of Ireland is, as stated by the hon. Member, 6.40 p.m., or with a late fee 7.40 p.m. It would hardly be practicable with the present train service to afford any extension of time at the post office, but letters may be posted in the mail train at Amiens Street Station up to 8.20 p.m. A letter which misses the despatch by the 8.20 train will still be delivered in Belfast at 9.30 next morning.

Defence of the United Kingdom.

Colonel WELBY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Imperial Defence Committee is of opinion that our Fleets can safeguard the United Kingdom, under all circumstances of war, against invasion by raiding or by larger forces; if not, what authoritative calculation they have arrived at of the number of troops, not liable to be serving abroad when such invasion may occur, necessary for defence.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. and gallant friend I have to say that, in the opinion of the Defence Committee, invasion for the purposes of conquest of these islands is an impossibility. The question of raids is a less important one, and is also a more complicated one, and I should hardly like to give an opinion on the subject by way of Question and Answer across the floor of the House; but I think I may go the length of informing my hon. and gallant friend that they are not a source of serious anxiety to His Majesty's Government.

Colonel WELBY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether we are to accept the figures supplied by the War Office to the Norfolk Commission?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I must ask for notice of that Question.

Scottish Church Dispute.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that in connection with the church dispute in Scotland the representatives of the Free Church have, in a large proportion of the cases in which Sir John Cheyne, the Government Commissioner, has issued recommendations, disregarded these recommendations, and are evicting the United Free Church ministers and congregations from the churches of which they are in possession; and what steps the Government propose to take in the matter.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to the right hon. Gentleman I have to say that the Government have learned, and learned with the very greatest regret, of the action which the Free Church of Scotland has taken in reference to one of the Commissions now sitting in respect of the ecclesiastical disputes in that country. With regard to the last clause of the Question we hope, as soon as we have received the Report of the Elgin Commission and have had time to consider it, to introduce legislation which will deal with the whole circumstances.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PROPOSAL TO EXPEDITE SUPPLY.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman what Estimates he proposes to take on

Wednesday and Thursday, and why has he altered the arrangement made to take Supplementary Estimates to-day.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: It would also be a convenience if the right hon. Gentleman can tell us what will be taken on Monday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is quite true that I had hoped to be able to proceed with Supplementary Estimates to-day. Subsequent to the announcement which I made to that effect yesterday the adjournment was moved and the order of business was to that extent upset, and we did not make as much progress as was expected. We therefore continue discussion with Vote 1 to-day. I think it probable that on Thursday we shall go on with the Supplementary Estimates, and on Monday with the Vote on Account. As regards to-morrow, I have to give notice that I have been carefully examining the condition of Supply in reference to the legal obligation under which the Government and the House lie to deal with certain financial matters before the end of the financial year, and I have come to the conclusion that without taking special measures there is no possibility of attaining that object. I propose to move a Resolution to-morrow with the view of attaining that object. I cannot at the moment give the terms of the Resolution which I shall move, though I hope to announce them to-night before the adjournment of the House. I may say generally that the lines on which I shall proceed are those which govern the final stages of ordinary Supply.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he seriously expected yesterday to take Vote A and Vote 1 of the Navy Estimates in a single sitting of the House. Has he ever known such a thing?

MR. BRYCE: Is the House to understand by what the right hon. Gentleman has just told it that it is proposed to suspend the 12 o'clock rule to-morrow? Can the right hon. Gentleman indicate more specifically what he means?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If I may judge from some informal interruptions, my meaning is perfectly apprehended by most of those opposite. The procedure contemplated is not precisely identical with, but is analogous to, that by which we close the annual Supply of the year.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: When does the right hon. Gentleman propose to put this new guillotine rule down for discussion?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to put it down to-morrow for discussion.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): May I ask whether the limitation of discussion to which the House is to be made to submit is not really due to the late summoning of Parliament and the late presentation of the Estimates?

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not relate to the course of business?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask whether, in view of this important announcement of a new, important, and far-reaching rule, the right hon. Gentleman does not think longer notice should be given, inasmuch as it will be impossible for hon. Members to put on the Paper the Amendments they will desire to move.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite understand objection being taken to the principle of the proposal I shall make, and no doubt exception will be so taken; but I do not think that longer notice is required, nor is it in accordance with the ordinary practice of this House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: There is no precedent for such a Motion at this date.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There are precedents, unfortunately, for the state of business in this House instantly requiring the taking of exceptional measures.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Never.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Not before March 31st.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If I may be allowed to say so, I have looked into this matter, and I have expressed my opinion. To-morrow I shall be glad to enter into this question.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Does the right hon. Gentleman seriously suggest there is a single precedent for a guillotine Resolution before March 31st.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I never suggested anything of that kind.

Mr. BRYCE: I desire to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether there is any precedent for putting down a Motion of this kind without an opportunity to hon. Members of moving Amendments.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Certainly there is plenty of opportunity. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to deal with this question at the proper time.

*Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask whether the object of bringing the guillotine into operation is to close the Parliamentary session by March 31st.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The object of the process the hon. Gentleman describes is to enable the House to obey the law of the land.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give us one day's notice and allow the Resolution to be taken on Thursday.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I honestly think that the course I have suggested will be for the general convenience of the House.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEE).

Mr. Wodehouse reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Fifteen Members to serve on the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure in respect of the Trades Unions and Trades Disputes Bill:—Mr. Attorney-General, Sir Thomas Wrightson, Mr. Duke, Sir William Tomlinson, Colonel Pilkington, Sir Charles Renshaw, Mr. Galloway, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Bell, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Randles, and Mr. Pemberton.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

JUVENILE SMOKING BILL.

"To provide for the prevention of Juvenile Smoking," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. John Burns, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Crooks, Sir John Gorst, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Lloyd-George, Major Seely, Dr. Shipman, Sir John Tuke, Mr. Cathcart Wason, and Mr. George White; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 30th March, and to be printed. [Bill 99.]

SALE OF WHISKY BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Sale of Whisky, and to provide for the marking of casks and other vessels containing whisky," presented by Sir Herbert Maxwell; supported by Mr. Grenfell, Captain Donelan, Colonel McCalmont, and Mr. Kilbride; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 12th April, and to be printed. [Bill 100.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1905–6.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,672,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1906."

*Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said that this money Vote afforded the Committee a fitting opportunity of discussing the financial aspect of the new distribution scheme which the Secretary to the Admiralty had placed before the House. They had had considerable debate as to the financial control of the House, and he would like to point out that, apart from any new measure of control, the Government were not really adhering to the ordinary rules which ought to govern the discussion of Supply. Last year they had on the Army Estimates a statement that those Estimates did not apply to the scheme then to be adopted by the War Office, and now in regard to the Navy they had Estimates which certainly had been framed in accordance with the new scheme of distribution, but they had not had from the official in charge any statement as to what reduction was due to the scheme which had been proposed by the naval authorities. If that new scheme had involved an increase of expenditure they would have had from the Admiralty a statement as to how that increase was made up, and the mere fact that the scheme showed a reduction surely was no excuse for information being withheld. He had no doubt there was a considerable saving as the result of the new proposals. They had the Estimate before them and it showed the considerable reduction as compared with last year of £3,500,000. Of course they had to deduct from that £1,000,000 which was in the Estimate of last year for the two Chilian war vessels. That reduced the net reduction to £2,500,000. What the House was entitled to know was what proportion of that reduction of £2,500,000 was due to the new scheme of redistribution. That it would amount to a considerable sum was shown by the Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty issued on December 6th last. The noble Lord concluded that Memorandum by saying that the scheme would greatly increase the fighting efficiency of the Fleet, and he was happy to say would also result in very considerable economy on the Naval Estimates. Surely they were entitled to know what that "considerable economy" was.

He gathered from the speech which the Prime Minister delivered in Glasgow on January 12th last, that a very large saving was anticipated, for, in speaking of the ships which were to be discarded, the right hon. Gentleman said they had abolished 130 vessels which figured on the list of the British Navy, and in so doing had made certain economies. They had not depleted the Navy for the mere sake of saving a few hundred thousands or millions; they had not sacrificed the strength of the force on which the well-being of the country depended. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to say that the cost of their maintenance and repairs—he did not go into figures—was very big, and that had been struck off the Navy Estimates. That went to show that, unless the Prime Minister was speaking with his tongue in his cheek, he had the figures before him, and if he had them, why should they be withheld from the Committee? They were entitled to an answer to that question. The Admiralty must have considered the financial effect of their distribution scheme before they launched it on the country, and, according to the First Lord's Statement, and according also to the statement of the Prime Minister, those figures were available. If they were not, surely it would be a most extraordinary thing on the part of the Admiralty to come to a decision in regard to a great scheme of redistribution without taking into consideration what the financial effect of their proposal was likely to be.

There had been some confusion in regard to the figures connected with the scheme. The First Lord told them that 130 vessels were to be abolished, the Secretary to the Admiralty said there were to be no fewer than 160, and later on the hon. Gentleman qualified that statement by saying that only eighty-four were to go on the scrap heap for three years, and on the previous day he gave a still further qualification. Now the hon. Gentleman had been exceedingly fair to the Committee, he had given them all the information in his power, and therefore he was not to be blamed. The Department, however, was to be blamed for withholding figures, or, in the alternative, for producing a scheme of that magnitude without considering what its financial result would be. An excuse, and probably a justification, for the reduction of the Estimates was to be found in the great increase which had occurred in those Estimates in the last few years, an increase which had amounted in two years to £9,000,000. They had treated the Secretary to the Admiralty fairly and had admitted that, so far as the information was available, the scheme proposed was based on sound principles, and he thought that the hon. Gentleman should be equally fair to the Committee and should give them the figures on which the scheme was based, and should show what saving it was expected to effect. He told them the other day that a certain saving had been effected from the fact that they had been making up leeway, and that ships were in better repair, and that, therefore, it was possible to slacken expenditure to a certain extent. Well, a certain amount of the saving might be due to that, but he thought that before proceeding further with the discussion they ought to have from the hon. Gentleman a statement as to what was to be the economy consequent on the adoption of the distribution scheme.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) said he wished to touch on one part of the policy announced by the Admiralty, and that was in connection with the change of arrangements in the Northern Pacific and Northern Atlantic as to the disposition of our squadrons there. He quite realised that when we obtained undisputed supremacy of the seas it became our duty to be the police of the ocean, but now that other nations had come to the front and were prepared to take their share in policing arrangements, it surely was our duty to concentrate our Fleets, not to scatter our vessels all over the ocean simply as police but to utilise them as military units for fighting purposes. He held that the concentration of our vessels into a fighting organisation must prove a decided advantage, but before we decided to do away with certain bases, and with our occupation of certain seas, it was necessary we should consider whether that in itself was the best thing to do, and whether it was a suitable policy at the present moment. He would take first the case of the Northern Pacific. When we were at war with Russia we decided to attack Petropavlovsk, and then we found we had absolutely no bases whatever in the Pacific Ocean except certain harbours in Peru and Chili. It was, therefore, necessary to establish some form of naval base, and we consequently occupied a point of land where the Hudson Bay Company was then established, and we decided to use it simply as a place to which to carry our wounded after the attack on Petropavlovsk. It never was a dockyard establishment or a naval yard. It was now proposed to withdraw our squadron from the Northern Pacific and to close our base at Vancouver Island, but it would be well to remember that there might come a time in which we should not be in the position we now were in the Pacific, when we should not have certain allies to whom we could turn, and then our only base would be the secondary one at Hong-Kong. There was, at the present time, a coast line of a growing country under the British flag—he referred to Canada—and he would ask was it wise that we should absolutely abandon the only position on that coast line from which we could exercise any control in the Northern Pacific. It was perfectly true that we did not intend to give up our yards, but what was the use of keeping yards if they were to be stripped of all their stores, and if the buildings were simply to be put in the charge of caretakers.

A Question was asked that afternoon in the House to which no definite answer was given, but in the House of Commons of Canada within the last few days the Minister of Militia had announced that after July it was the intention of the Canadian Government to take over the garrisons of Esquimalt and Halifax and to maintain the fortifications there at the expense of the Canadian Government. So far, so good, but what were the garrisons to defend unless they were to protect the naval bases. Surely they were not going only to protect some old sheds in charge of caretakers. Knowing what he did of the country, he was aware that to place these buildings merely in charge of caretakers would not be sufficient. It would involve the keeping up of a large body of labourers and mechanics to maintain them in proper repair, and surely it would be a much better plan—it was one he had suggested to the late First Lord of the Admiralty—that these yards should be handed over to the Dominion Government, that they should take charge of the garrisons and fortifications, and of the naval yards as well, and that they should hold those yards available for our Navy whenever we wished to use them. That applied especially to Esquimalt.

Now he came to the Atlantic coast. He wished to know where the Commander-in-Chief of the North American Squadron was to have his official residence. Was it to be at Plymouth, or the Bermudas, or Halifax, or Jamaica? The proposed closing of the station at Halifax was a very serious matter. We had a large and important property there, in fact, the Imperial Government owned one-third of the whole water frontage, and thus prevented the commercial development of the town. Were we going to put that property in charge of a caretaker and not allow it to be devoted to any useful purpose? Such a policy would not redound to the credit of the Imperial Government. Attached to the Admiralty House were large grounds, a fine naval hospital, and magazines. Would it not be better that they should be utilised for some purpose by the Dominion Government, in return for keeping them in good order? Again, he would like to point out that if we were to keep cruisers in the West Indies all the year round there would be a great deal of sickness. There must be a base on the coast of British North America to which these vessels could go for supplies, and consequently, instead of closing this station altogether let them hand it over to the Dominion Government on the conditions he had suggested.

*Mr. BLACK (Banffshire) said the Secretary to the Admiralty had persistently declined to make any statement as to the policy which had actuated the Government in putting forward the new redistribution scheme, and surely there was no better or more appropriate and available time for making such a statement than the present. Unless that statement was made, all their discussions must necessarily be in large measure futile. He supposed the thought originally in the mind of the Admiralty was that of concentration, but the question was whether they had not stopped short of full concentration. The idea, he supposed, was that the Fleet should remain at home for the purpose of home defence; and the next step, he presumed, was that there should be a good strong Fleet in being, preponderating in strength compared with any other fleet, a possible concentration of fleets, so as to be itself sufficient protection of our shores, our mercantile marine, our Colonies, and our dependencies, and if this concentrated fleet was strong enough in itself it was almost equally useful for purposes of mercantile and colonial defence, that it should have its main base in the British Islands as compared with its being permanently based in whole or in part out of these Islands. Had he, in this, correctly stated the underlying idea of the Admiralty? If this were their underlying idea why did they still retain two bases outside the United Kingdom; why did they abandon the base in the Firth of Forth which they originally put forward? And why did they continue, apparently, to base two divisions of the fleet at Gibraltar and Malta respectively, away ever so far from the true base of the fleet, viz., these islands, which it was their main function to defend? When we considered the necessity of concentration, we had only to put to ourselves what a hostile fleet would do. Supposing it was advancing to the attack of our fleets, would not its first object be to throw itself between the Fleet at Gibraltar and Malta and the Home Fleet before they could concentrate? It was difficult to understand, if concentration was the main object of the Government, why they had not followed it out further and so have afforded accommodation in the British Islands for the battleships they had properly built and put into commission. He again urged the necessity of the Committee being put in possession of full information which would enable it to deal with the large objects of policy raised, and upon which the financial aspects of the whole scheme so largely depended.

Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said that on the previous day several speakers protested against so much ship construction being given to private yards, and asserted that it would be cheaper to have it done in the Government dockyards. He utterly protested against that idea, and he was borne out in that by the Memorandum of the First Lord, in which it was stated that experience had shown that new construction could certainly be more cheaply executed in private yards than in the Royal dockyards. He trusted that the Secretary to the Admiralty would not give way to the pressure brought to bear on him and go back on the Statement of the First Lord. There was nothing unreasonable in the position which the Admiralty had taken up in this matter. Experience proved that private firms, working for profit, were able to put an energy into their work which was not the case in Government yards, however well managed. Apart from that, even if it cost more to build in private than in Government yards, it was to the advantage of the State that these private firms should be encouraged; for in times of stress it would be very unfortunate if the Government could only work in their own yards, and unless something was done to keep the private yards going in ordinary times it would be impossible for them to maintain their establishments in a state of efficiency for times of stress. In regard to the general policy of the Admiralty, he did not complain so much of the large number of ships written off the fighting list of the Fleet; but he thought it was rather a question whether some of those left on the list were of full fighting efficiency, so far as armour was concerned. He called the attention of the Secretary to the Admiralty to three classes of ships, which, he suggested were not up to the full standard of efficiency—the "Canopus," the "Majestic," and the "Royal Sovereign" classes. The first contained six, the second nine, and the third eight battleships. With the view of putting these vessels in a state of full fighting efficiency, he suggested that they should be re-armoured throughout. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would give an answer to his suggestion when the Construction Vote came on for discussion in detail.

*MR. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.) said that they must all feel grateful for the somewhat wide and general discussion which had been given to Vote I., for it seemed extremely likely that before many other Votes were reached the guillotine would come down. He hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would therefore give the Committee answers to some questions that hardly appeared to be covered by the present Vote. Had anything been done in the way of continuing the experiments in the use of liquid fuel on board His Majesty's ships? That might be brought up under the Stoker Vote, but there was a general hope that even the largest ships in the Navy would be equipped with apparatus for using liquid fuel on account of its enormous convenience and saving in storage space. Last year he asked a Question as to the naval chaplains and naval instructors carried on board ship. The answer was that in twenty-one ships the offices of chaplain and instructor were held by the same individual; and that in twenty-seven ships the offices were duplicated. If it was possible to duplicate them in some, there was no reason why the two offices should not be held by the same individual in all ships, and a considerable saving in cabin space be thereby effected.

The hon. Member for Donegal had raised the question of flogging in the Navy. He (Mr. Lyell), had one qualification for speaking on the subject, for probably he was one of the last Members who had left school. When the hon. Member for South Donegal was speaking it was evident that every word came from the heart, and that every sentence was winged with conviction. And yet it was a speech with some of which he found himself in profound disagreement. There was one sentence which he was sorry to hear cheered from these benches; and that was that this was a punishment inflicted by the rich on the children of the poor, and a punishment to which the children of the rich were not subjected. He ventured to traverse that statement. Many hon. Members had been at a public school, and they knew, from painful experience, how discipline was maintained there. He knew also that if a master in a Board school used that form of punishment he was likely to find an action at law on his hands. The public feeling on the matter was now keener than it used to be. He happened to be the possessor of an Eton birch. His interest in it was purely academic, and not personal. The hon. Member for South Donegal had made an appeal to the House because the Navy birch weighed nine ounces, and the police birch only four and a-half ounces. He had had the curiosity to weigh the Eton birch, and found that, although there had been considerable loss of weight due to attrition and ordinary wear and tear, it still weighed fourteen ounces, or more than the police and the Navy birch put together. He thought that the general sense of the House was that it would be a mistake to abolish either birching or caning in the Navy. It was an appropriate punishment for boys, but only as long as they were boys. As long as a boy was a boy it was the best punishment for him, and very much less cruel than the alternative of confinement in cells; but the moment he began to fancy himself a man there was a danger of inflicting a serious blow to his self-respect, and doing injury to his character by inflicting the birch or cane. Why should there not be an inquiry with a view to making the limit of age very rigid. Such punishment should only be inflicted on boys; not on young men, although they might be technically rated as boys. Another point on which he desired to lay stress was the question of publicity. He believed that a majority of hon. Members deplored these public birchings. He hoped that the Secretary to the Admiralty would assent to the suggestion of his hon. friend and introduce a reform in the matter both of publicity and severity of the punishments.

*MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said that as regards the analogy of school boys he had always thought that birching, on the whole, would be better, because it was more satisfactory to a boy than to have some of those irritating punishments and unhealthy detentions indoors, which certainly did him no good, and as an alternative to which the more salutary principle of whipping was beneficial. He felt that there was no occasion for a layman to apologise in discussing naval matters. In his opinion it was a great misfortune to the country that laymen took such little interest in naval matters. Englishmen were prone to look upon the Navy as a religion and take everything that concerned it for granted. An admiral in the position of Sir John Fisher seemed to occupy a post analogous to that of the Pope, for to speak disrespectfully of the First Sea Lord was, as it were, to speak disrespectfully of a Pope. He had no object in speaking disrespectfully of the First Sea Lord because he did not know him, but it was not wise for any man, be he who he might, to be in a position to say whatever he liked and always be supposed to be right. He entered a caveat against anybody occupying that position in the British Navy, and that was why laymen should take an interest in these matters. The right hon. Member for Ealing entered a plea yesterday for the further employment of Marines in places and positions where they could be more effectively used. There was no branch of the service more rightly admired by those who knew anything about them. He was persuaded that in many instances they were not treated quite as well as the other branches of the service. He gave illustrations of the disadvantage as regards *status* under which Marine Officers suffered as compared with Naval Officers, and hoped that the Admiralty might see their way to arrive at some readjustment, the more so inasmuch as the *status* of paymasters and others had lately been improved. There was a variety of questions which hon. Members representing dockyard constituencies desired to bring forward. He did not propose to take any such course. He would suggest to his hon. friend that it would be more convenient that these matters should be arranged by private conference; and he hoped the Board of Admiralty would be willing to meet the dockyard Members and discuss matters which they would represent to the Board to the best of their ability.

*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said after listening to the arguments he was not at all convinced that birching was a useful discipline in the Navy. All hon. Members were agreed that it should not be applied to men; but men were "only children of a larger growth." Discipline which was good for men would be also good for boys. Birching was a barbarous punishment, and was very disgraceful; discipline could easily be maintained otherwise. Flogging was abolished in the Army twenty years ago, and no complaint followed. Its abolition in the Navy was a concession to the growth of decency and civilisation which would have to be granted some day. Why not now? [illegible]

He desired to call attention to what was described as a "revolution" in the policy of the Admiralty. Revolution was a large word—it was used in the First Lord's Statement, but he was inclined to deprecate it. Nothing particularly fresh had occurred in recent years, especially as far as new construction by foreign nations was concerned. Experiments were, of course, in progress; but they did not justify the use of the word "revolution." It was merely an attempt by the Admiralty to cover a retreat from a position they could not sustain. For ten years he had steadily protested against the increase in the Navy Votes, and had maintained that a too rapid increase would lead to a too rapid decrease. That position had been justified. Ten years ago the Navy Estimates were £18,000,000; but since then there had been a total increase over that amount of £110,000,000. If instead of that gigantic increase there had been a steady increase of £500,000 a year, there would have been a saving of £83,000,000 in ten years and that would have been a great advantage both to the nation and to the Navy. He supposed we were only at the beginning of these years of economy. We had a reduction of £3,500,000 this year, and no doubt we should have a reduction of £3,000,000 next year, but he must enter his protest against these great jumps up and down in our expenditure, which were not good for the country.

Dealing with the new cruisers which were to be such an important part of the Fleet, the Statement of the First Lord said they were to be capable of such speed that they could overtake everything and that nothing could catch them, and then it proceeded to speak of the cruisers which had been built within the last ten years, and said that with such vessels as the new cruisers the so-called protected cruisers would engage at considerable disadvantage; that their armour would not be sufficient to keep them safe, and their speed would not be sufficiently great to allow them to run away. A more sweeping condemnation of the policy of the Admiralty had never been heard in the House. It was a great mistake to suppose that those cruisers which were not struck off the active list retained their old position in the Fleet. They did nothing of the kind. They were not struck off, but very soon would be, and their position for useful fighting had been much changed. In that list, in which there was no vessel more than ten years old, there were twenty-one first-class, forty-six second-class, and twenty-one third-class cruisers. Eighty-eight cruisers in all, built during the last ten years at a total cost of £24,500,000. Practically this large fleet, built at so great a cost, was now condemned as useless. That was a most significant statement. At the present moment these ships were manned with 34,000 men, and if they were of no use why was it necessary to keep their crews up to the full complement. So much had been said about the 166 ships that were to be struck off the list that he need not refer further to them except to say that the number to be struck off was not 166 but 254, because these cruisers would have to be added. Many of the 166 had also been built within the last ten years; indeed it appeared to him from the Estimates of the present year that some of the ships listed in both categories were not yet finished, and on others large sums were being expended for repairs. He would emphasise the application already made to the Secretary to the Admiralty to fulfil the promise made at Glasgow and show the Committee what was the economy resulting from this great change of policy.

Another revolution was with regard to the destroyers, which was also a great condemnation of the policy of the Admiralty. So far as the destroyers were concerned, till that moment everybody thought we were up to date. They took the place of the old gun-boats and the torpedo boats, but the destroyers which we had did not appear to be strong enough to go to sea, and were apparently of not much use close inshore. Therefore we were to have two new classes, one was to be for work inshore and in harbours, and then there was to be a sea-going destroyer of a more expensive character. But what, he asked, was to become of the great fleet of destroyers we had at present? Had they no function? Were they completely superannuated? Were we to have a third list of vessels nearly knocked up and thrown aside? It was a most remarkable state of things. For ten years we had been spending money on vessels now declared to be useless. The destroyers had gone and the first, second, and third-class cruisers had gone. He did not suggest that experiments should not be made, but he thought they should be made upon a far more economical scale. It was perfectly monstrous that so many of these ships should be built during these years for experimental purposes. The experiments would have been equally well made with only six cruisers. This point went to the bottom of the whole of the Estimates during recent years. There was a large new Vote for submarines, which were being ordered by the dozen. Why could not we go economically to work? There had been some dreadful accidents with submarines, and before we ordered so many to be built we should see whether they would be useful. After all, real economy in the Navy lay with the House of Commons, and when the laxity of the House in dealing with these Estimates disappeared they would see the end of all this extravagance. He supported his hon. friend the Member for Dundee in the application he had made for a full Return, and he suggested that the Committee should warn the Admiralty that they would not enter into this discussion again without full information. Some attempt would, no doubt, be made to correct the two Returns which had been made with regard to the overlapping of the ships. Sixteen ships appeared both in the list of those to be struck off the effective list and in the list of those which were to be retained.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that under Head 1, ships were included in both lists. Head 1 was "combatant ships." He admitted that it was somewhat confusing.

MR. LOUGH said the explanation made it somewhat more intelligible, but these vessels should not appear in both lists. The Government ought to give a Return showing all the ships which were to be struck off the list, and where the economy came in by striking them off, and then no one could complain? If the Committee approved this new policy of a smaller and more effective Navy then they must condemn the reckless extravagance in the past. But the real reason for this economy must be looked for outside the House. The Government might be in search of a deathbed repentance, but they had to acknowledge a force against which they were powerless, which was resolved to deliver the country from this intolerable burden.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester) said the hon. Member for West Islington, in asserting that some £80,000,000 might have been saved had the Government pursued a different policy, overlooked the fact that the country would not then have been in possession of a Navy which would have enabled her to hold her own in recent crises. It was only the possession of an overpowering Navy which brought us safely through the Fashoda crisis, or enabled us to keep the ring during the South African War. If the hon. Member had had his way, that Navy would not have been in existence, the country would have had to give way, and the probabilities were that expenditure in other directions would have had to be incurred far in excess of the amount which had been spent on the Navy. He thought, therefore, the country ought to congratulate themselves that the naval policy had not been under the control of the hon. Member and his friends. The debate had afforded remarkable testimony to the success of Lord Selborne's administration. There had been attacks on details, but there had been no attack on his policy in general, so that in laying down his great trust the late First Lord might feel that he had discharged it to the general satisfaction of the House and the country. He approached the consideration of these Estimates from an entirely different standpoint from that of the last speaker. The first thought of the hon. Member was as to the bill we had to pay and whether anything had been saved to the country. On the other hand, the first question he put to himself, as everything depended on the Navy, was whether the Estimates as presented were such as would put us in possession of such a Navy as was essential for the safety of the country. When the Estimates were looked at from that point of view, two considerations at once presented themselves, viz., was the Navy strong enough for the duties it had to perform, and was that Navy ready for war? Recent experience had shown that one of the first essential attributes of a navy was readiness for instant action. Great Britain could not afford an initial disaster; she must be in a position to strike at once with overpowering force. Various steps had been taken by the Admiralty to place the Navy in a position to strike such a blow should necessity arise. There had been eliminated a large number of vessels supposed to be either too weak for action in the fighting line or too slow to run away. He and many of his friends on that side of the House had repeatedly urged upon the Admiralty the advisability of getting rid of the weaker and slower of those ships.

*MR. LOUGH: But we are building them still.

MR. YERBURGH (continuing) submitted that the result of such a policy must be to increase the efficiency of the Fleet by making it more ready for action. The next point was as to the crews. Had anything been done to increase their efficiency? After studying the Memorandum of the First Lord, he had come to the conclusion that the Admiralty had largely increased the efficiency of the Fleet in that direction. The old system under which the crews of the Home and Channel Squadrons were replenished as to 25 per cent. of their number every twenty-six months had been abandoned, and there was now only one description of service, while the term of commission was two years. As a result of that change, the officers of the Navy were constantly exercised in their duties for a period of two years, and that meant a great advance in efficiency. If the Fleet was to be in fighting order, it was necessary that the reserve ships should be prepared to go to sea with their machinery free from all chance of breaking down, and with their crews thoroughly exercised in gunnery. What were the Admiralty doing in this direction? They were crowding at these ports the Reserve Fleets, the captains and seconds in command of which were to be on board, and also a large proportion of their war complement. Those ships would be more ready for action; and they were to go out periodically for gunnery practice, so that the crews would be efficient in gunnery and practised in the art of seamanship. All that tended to efficiency. Moreover, these reserve ships were to be under the command of an officer directly responsible for their efficiency. The Admiralty were to be warmly congratulated with having done so much to increase the strength of the Fleet, but it was necessary to go a step further. They might have the Fleets ready for action, and the crews ready to join them, but that would be of no avail in the day of battle unless the men behind the guns were efficient. Not very long ago it was the custom in this country to regard gunnery practice as altogether unnecessary, and it was a common habit for ships of war to throw practice ammunition overboard. That had been entirely altered. Year after year Lord Selborne had called attention to the vital importance of gunnery, and, according to the last statements, the gunnery was still improving. He was delighted that an Inspector of Target Practice had been appointed, as an officer in that position could render great service to the gunnery efficiency of the Fleet. He held in his hand an account of some wonderful target practice on the "Narcissus," in the course of which a man named Hollingshurst made seven hits out of ten on a target 6 feet by 8 feet, at a distance of from 1,500 to 1,600 yards. The value of that record was not so much the individual performance as the fact that it set a standard for the whole Fleet. He desired to know whether it was the intention of the authorities to retain the services of these expert gun layers?

As to the distribution of the Fleet, he could not conceive why the Committee should not be told the reason for the alterations which had been made. In the German and the French Legislatures the position of other countries was openly discussed. In a recent speech in the French Chamber, the Minister of Marine compared the strength of the French fleet with the German fleet, showing what an enormous disproportion of force had arisen in the growth of the German fleet. It was perfectly well known that the real reason for the redistribution of the Fleet was the very great growth of naval power in the North Sea. The French Minister said that in 1871 the French fleet was superior to the combined fleet of the Triple Alliance, and had a crushing superiority over the German fleet, but that in 1908 the German fleet would be three-fourths as strong as the French fleet, and that in 1917, the German programme having been completed, the German fleet would be stronger than the French fleet in the proportion of five to four. That showed how much the German fleet had grown as compared with the French fleet, and afforded a reason for the redistribution of the British Fleet for strategical purposes. In 1917 the German fleet would amount to thirty-eight first-class battleships, fourteen large cruisers, thirty-eight small cruisers, and fourteen torpedo boat divisions. That was a very large and powerful fleet, which, it must be remembered, was concentrated in the North Sea, and the officers and men of which were constantly exercised in manœuvres. A matter of that kind could not possibly be overlooked. It would have been altogether unwise for those responsible for the naval policy of the country to have allowed distribution based upon other considerations of naval strength to continue in being. It would probably be said that to make such a statement was not consonant with a proper understanding of the relations between this and other countries. He would remind the Committee, however, that such reticence was not observed in other Chambers. It had been pointed out in the Reichstag that this increase in the fleet could not be intended for the purpose of a war with the United States, France, or Russia, and he had come to the conclusion that this increase in the German navy could only be meant as a menace to Great Britain. That was a German politician speaking in his own Chamber. He noted with regret the very small programme of new construction which the Admiralty had thought fit to adopt, for it included only one battleship. In view of the possible combinations of foreign fleets against our own, he did not think the Government were justified in adopting such a small programme of new construction. For the past seven years they had not been building up to the two-Power standard, and he was bound to say that he did not think the Admiralty had been well advised in the course they had taken.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said it was perfectly evident that any calculation of the saving on the present distribution of the Fleet would have to take into account the amount which would have been spent on those ships had they been retained in the service. That calculation could not be made in pounds, shillings, and pence without a good deal of unnecessary trouble.

*Mr. McCRAE said the Prime Minister led a Glasgow audience to believe that he had those figures in his possession.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said the £500,000 saved upon repairs was largely due to the particular policy.

*Mr. McCRAE said that surely the hon. Member could give them a round sum. The Government claimed a reduction of £2,500,000, and all that had been shown was about £100,000.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said he had indicated the saving that was attributable to these particular ships not having to be repaired. There were other savings in regard to stores and naval bases. To make a calculation as to what would have been spent had they not adopted the new scheme would be a most unusual course, and it would give no corresponding advantage for the trouble it would give to the Department. As to the question of the care and maintenance of the naval base at Halifax and Esquimalt, that had not been lost sight of, and he was sure that the Government would be prepared to negotiate with the Canadian Government upon the subject. The squadron at Devonport would make two cruises every year and would be mainly a training squadron. It would visit Bermuda, Halifax, and other ports, training boys for the Navy. Two vessels would be kept in the West Indies, and they would visit Halifax at the proper season of the year. One of the advantages of this arrangement would be that they would have the excellent winter climate in the West Indies and the excellent summer climate on the North American station for the development of growing lads on board. With regard to the North Pacific, the immediate local danger they had to guard against at present did not appear to warrant the maintenance of a naval base at Esquimalt. He could assure the hon. and gallant Member for Yarmouth that the Pacific had been fully considered. The hon. and gallant Member also raised the question of future possibilities in the Pacific, but he thought it would be realised that distribution was a shifting problem, and because the needs of the present day demanded the distribution now submitted it did not follow that in two or three years time fresh considerations might not arise, and the Admiralty did not bind themselves to maintain in the future exactly the same distribution as to-day. Should circumstances require the presence of a stronger force in the Pacific the Admiralty were perfectly ready to deal with them.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said the point he raised was not the present distribution so much as the power of repairing and even of producing ships and the necessity of a primary base in the near future in the Pacific.

MR. PRETYMAN said that in considering the question of Fleet bases one of the possibilities of the future was that they could rely upon auxiliary vessels for supplies, and that ought to be taken into account. The policy adopted was to spend the money at places which it was practically certain would remain as permanent and necessary bases for the Fleet, and rely more upon mobile ships and auxiliaries in other parts. He thought that was more satisfactory from the point of view of economy and the actual necessities of the Fleet. If his hon. and gallant friend meant that they should be able to build ships abroad he did not think there was any possibility of that policy being adopted, and they were not prepared to deal with it now as a matter of practical politics.

The hon. Member for South Donegal had spoken upon the question of birching and caning in the Navy. There were one or two points which he thought should be cleared up. They had been repeatedly told that there ought to be no birching in the Navy, because there was none in the Army and none in foreign navies. The simple reason for this was that there were no boys in the Army or in foreign navies, and birching was clearly a form of punishment applicable to boys but not to men. The only reason for birching or caning being retained in the Navy was because in the opinion of the Admiralty that was a better form of punishment for boys than confinement. He thought that would be generally accepted as a fact. While he recognised the absolute sincerity of the speech of the hon. Member for South Donegal last week, it really was not an attack on the system, but it amounted to an attack on the alleged misuse of the system in the Navy. The hon. Member had read out extracts from various letters, but there were no dates or names given, and he could not help thinking that some old shellbacks had been getting at the hon. Member. He had made most careful personal inquiry in order to ascertain whether there had really been the slightest foundation in recent years for any of the allegations which the hon. Member made, and he could honestly assure the Committee that he had found none. If chapter and verse were given of any case where there had been a misuse of the power of birching boys it would be inquired into. The punishment of birching was intended to be applied in the Navy in exactly the same way as it was applied in the public schools. The hon. Member for South Donegal was mistaken in saying that one system obtained in the "Britannia" and another in the training ships. The boys in both cases were equally liable to be punished by birching. He thought he need not say any more in defence of a system which was admitted to be universal. He believed it was beneficial. He could only repeat that if any case of undue severity were brought to the notice of the Admiralty it would be investigated as the hon. Member for Dorsetshire had suggested.

MR. LYELL: Would you give publicity to the birching?

*MR. PRETYMAN said he would. [AN HON. MEMBER: It's brutal.] It might sound brutal, but he thought that what might seem very terrible here had no brutality attached to it if carried out in the free atmosphere of a man-of-war. Hon. Members here could hold up their heads and say that they had never felt any demoralisation or inferiority as the result of similar treatment which they had received in their school days. As to publicity, he would remind the hon. Member that there was only the choice between publicity and privacy. The objection to publicity he understood and appreciated. On the other hand, objection might equally be made to privacy. They would be told that if they were to whip a boy in private all sorts of cruelties might be practised. Under the present system, if there really were undue severity, evidence of it could be obtained, because it was done under the public eye. Another matter which should be remembered was that the punishment of birching could only be inflicted by the authority of the senior officer in charge of a training ship. The training ships were all in charge of a Rear-Admiral, and no boys could be birched without the authority of the Rear-Admiral himself.

MR. LYELL: The hon. Member says there is nothing between privacy and publicity. There is a difference between masses of boys and a few selected.

*MR. PRETYMAN: I think it is rather invidious to select certain boys to witness the punishment. I think a half-way house would be rather difficult to obtain.

MR. LOUGH said there might be a certain number of boys on board ship selected to witness the punishment, and to secure that everything was done decently and in order. It was absurd to suggest that there was no alternative between absolute publicity and absolute privacy.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he had put his view before the Committee. The hon. Member for Islington raised one or two points with which he thought he need not deal in detail. The hon. Member for Dundee last year prophesied solemnly that the Navy Estimates would gradually grow to £50,000,000, and now the hon. Member for Islington prophesied a steady annual reduction of £3,000,000. He did not think that either prophecy had a sure foundation. The Navy Estimates were dealt with by the Board of Admiralty on the needs of the year, and if the needs of the next year required a greater effort he was perfectly certain that the country would find the money and that the Admiralty would not hesitate to ask for it. They believed that the naval requirements for the year enabled them to ask £3,500,000 less. Whether there would be a reduction next year was a matter for the future, and they could not at present say what would be done. He thought prophecies were beside the mark.

*MR. MCCRAE asked whether the Admiralty could not even give a round sum to show what reduction would be effected by the new policy.

*MR. PRETYMAN said it was impossible to state a sum without showing what the Estimates would have been if there had been no change of policy. In order to give the estimate which the hon. Member desired it would be necessary to enter into an elaborate calculation, and he doubted whether such a calculation would be worth making when they had got it. The hon. Member for Islington had stated that Lord Selborne's Memorandum contained the names of combatant ships which were no longer equal to the latest ships, and that certain vessels had been condemned to the scrap heap which were still of fighting value. That was a criticism which would invariably be applied to naval administration. In all ships which were built the latest discoveries, inventions of science, and arrangements best adapted to give effect to naval experience were introduced. Each ship was an advance upon its predecessors and therefore the question required careful consideration from time to time whether ships of older types should be retained in the fighting line or relegated to the scrap heap. That was a problem which in the past had perhaps been insufficiently dealt with. One of the features of the scheme of the present year was the careful investigation which had been given to that problem. Every year that problem was to be re-examined, the ships which were added to the Fleet being weighed against the earlier built ships. There would always be a procession of ships passing from the fighting line into the llama class and thence to the sale list. As to destroyers, the present 25½ knot vessels were efficient and equal to any they were likely to meet with. To say that the destroyers we had now were out of date was not the fact. We had some which had not sufficient strength for ocean work and others in which speed had been to some extent sacrificed to increase their strength, but they were both excellent classes of vessels. By postponing the construction of the new destroyers for a short time the Admiralty were able to get a better type.

The question of oil fuel was a most important one. The use of oil fuel had now passed the experimental stage, and had reached the stage when not only individual ships but squadrons were able to burn oil combined with coal. There was a difficulty in the storage of oil on existing ships. The ships required for that purpose an expensive method of construction. The oil was stored in the ordinary water-tight compartments in the double bottoms, but the ordinary construction which resisted water was not sufficiently close to forbid the passage of oil. Therefore considerable expense had to be incurred in fitting up existing ships which were not constructed for the purpose of carrying oil. Every ship built in future would be constructed to carry oil as well as coal. The principle adopted was to burn oil in combination with coal. The oil was sprayed on the coal. He did not wish to go into particulars. Nothing would be gained by that. There was a difficulty in obtaining a sufficient supply of oil. One advantage which oil had over coal was that it did not deteriorate by keeping. They had to go for their oil outside the British Islands, but that was to some extent compensated for by their being able to store it in large quantities without its suffering deterioration. The question of supply was one which he hoped the Committee would not wish him to go into in detail. Every step was being taken to give the British Navy the greatest possible area of supply.

*MR. BLACK: What position does Rosyth occupy in this new scheme of distribution?

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): Is it true that the Report of the Boiler Committee has been thrown over, and a return made solely to the tubular boilers?

*MR. PRETYMAN: All boilers are now tubular.

MR. WHITLEY: Have cylindrical boilers been discarded against the recommendation of the Boiler Committee?

*MR. PRETYMAN said that the Boiler Committee issued two or three Reports, and in one of them, pending the completion of investigations and the issue of their final Report, they recommended that the Admiralty should adopt the system of one-fifth cylindrical boilers and four-fifths tubular boilers for the ships then under construction. That recommendation was adopted and ships were now coming into commission with an installation of one-fifth cylindrical boilers. The Committee, having completed their investigation and made their final Report, recommended that as the Yarrow and the Babcock and Wilcox type of boilers were so efficient they should be used without any proportion of cylindrical boilers. The ships which were now being laid down would receive the Babcock and Wilcox or the Yarrow type of boilers.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) asked whether the hon. Gentleman could inform the Committee approximately the difference of cost between oil and coal.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that the cost varied very much according to where the oil or the coal was taken on board. If oil was wanted in the Far East it was found close at hand at Borneo; but if coal was wanted it had to be sent from England. The cost of oil here was £2 per ton against about half that for coal. That, however, did not represent the relative value; because the value of a ton of oil, not vaporised in internal combustion engines, where the value was much higher, but burnt for steam-raising purposes, was not the same as that of a ton of coal. The Admiralty experience was that a ton of oil represented from one and a quarter to a ton and a half of coal — rather better than a ton and a quarter, and not so good as a ton and a half.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): Are we to understand that the Admiralty are not contemplating any return whatever to the Belleville boiler?

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that the Admiralty did not contemplate a return to the Belleville boiler. The great difficulty with the Belleville boiler was the burning of the casings and not so much that of coal consumption. As to Rosyth, he had already stated that what was to be done there could only be announced when the Loan Bill was introduced. But as to the value of Rosyth as a naval base in the future, the Board of Admiralty were convinced that their estimate of the value of the site for the purpose for which it was purchased was fully justified.

*Mr. BLACK: What is to be its place as one of the bases of the Fleet in the future?

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that until they reached the Loan Bill no positive statement could be made. As to the value of Rosyth as a naval base, the opinion of the Admiralty was that the purchase was justified. At present, however, there was no base at Rosyth, and the new scheme had been framed on the bases which actually existed.

*Mr. BLACK: We want to know exactly how the new scheme of distribution is to work out in the future in view of the use of Rosyth as a principal base.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that he could encourage the hon. Gentleman to look forward to receiving that information in the future but could not give it at the present time.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said the Committee would no doubt be gratified to hear that he had nor risen with any intention to discourse on naval tactics or naval construction. He did not pretend to be an authority on these matters. His knowledge was not so profound as that of the hon. Member for Chester, or the hon. Member for Islington, or even that of the late Lord Nelson. His ambition was a far more humble one. He wished to contribute some little thing towards a saving to the taxpayers of the country who were being eaten out of house and home by having to pay a huge insurance against the inroads of impossible invaders. He had put down an Amendment to the last Vote to reduce the number of men voted for the Navy by 10,000. Unfortunately his intention had been frustrated by the application of the closure. His friends perpetually told him not to get up, as he would interrupt the debate then going on, and, therefore, he had waited too long. He was not going to be cut out twice in the same way; hence he now moved an Amendment to reduce the sum in the Vote now before the Committee by £600,000. He believed that, roughly speaking, that amounted to a reduction of 10,000 sailors from the Fleet. He had been told on previous occasions that it was monstrous, after the men had been voted, to refuse them their pay. That would be monstrous if the men were employed; but if no pay were voted there would be no men to pay. It had been said that there was a reduction in the Naval Estimates, and the hon. Gentleman who represented the Admiralty had been congratulated on all sides on that reduction. But in looking into the matter, though the lads in the Navy, who were still to be subjected to the birch, were fewer, the number of men remained the same. The Government had boasted that they were going to put 160 vessels out of commission. He supposed that these ships had crews in them; and it was obvious that if 160 ships were to be put out of commission there would be so many sailors the less, unless they were to be kept on land in the hope that they would be employed when a war occurred.

He was one of those who had always been in favour of a strong Navy; but he wanted it to be both a strong and efficient Navy. He, however, did not want it to exceed the needs of the country. He was not one of those who believed that this wondrous world Empire of ours should be the absolute mistress of the seas. And for this reason: that the world would never allow it. This country might have an *entente cordiale* with one other country, or possibly two, but the great Powers of the world would always object to one Power having the others and their colonies at their mercy. When they talked of policing the seas, that might be a very good idea with the Archangel Gabriel coming down from Heaven to take command. But we were fallible, and to talk of policing the seas might be to take an excellent British view, but it was not one which would be always in accord with that of the other great Powers. Napoleon attempted to establish his empire over Europe, and declared that he would inaugurate an era of peace. However, nobody believed him, and he was sent to die in a small island in the South Atlantic. He believed that from the first moment when the Government set up a standard of nicely calculating building ships equal to those built by two or three other Powers, they encouraged other countries to go on building more ships. This was not a mere question of bravery or courage, but of the longest purse. This was a very rich nation; he trusted it would always remain so; but it was not richer than the rest of the world, and if we continued playing the game of "beggar my neighbour" the rest of the world would beat us.

Six years ago Lord Goschen stated, when 100,000 men were voted for the Navy, that we had then reached the extreme limit of what was possible for us to provide with our means. That number had gone up to 129,000 at the present time. In ten or twelve years the cost of the Navy had been almost doubled, and who paid for it? It was said to be for the benefit of the Empire, and particularly for the benefit of the Colonies. We told the Colonies how thankful they ought to be that we took the burden of their defence on our shoulders. We had no idea of taking any burden on our shoulders, fiscal, military, or naval. What they had to consider was the total amount which was being spent on armaments. The other day *The Times* stated — and it was good enough for him — that the total demand for military purposes exceeded that of last year by £913,000. Therefore they had this position, that while they were asked to pay enormous sums for the Navy, they were also asked to pay more for the Army. When the increase in the Navy Votes began, hon. Members were attacked not only on the sentimental side, but also on the practical side. It was said that the cost of the Army would be reduced, and he said to himself that he did not care whether the money was spent on the Army or the Navy so long as the total amount was reduced If they wanted to get on in this world they must, in large matters as in small, cut their coat according to their cloth. He believed he himself was one of the best friends of the Army and Navy in this House. The reason was this. There was already a reaction against excessive expenditure; that reaction would increase, and unless expenditure were cut down it would gain such force that the country would grant less money than was absolutely necessary for its requirements. The total amount now spent on the Army and Navy was double what it was twelve years ago. Hon. Gentlemen seemed inclined to discuss small details; but he remarked that when Gentlemen complained of expenditure in one direction they usually advocated it in another. He himself did not look to minor details, but to the general sum, and he struck at the whole matter by moving an Amendment to reduce it. They had been termed "Little Englanders." They were not "Little Englanders," but "Englanders," and followers of Gladstone and Peel. They did not conceal their view with reference to the Boer War; they disapproved of it, and said so; and many hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House who did not then agree with them now admitted that they were the only people who knew anything about it. These hon. Gentlemen would agree with them also when they found later that there would be a difficulty in getting adequate money to provide an insurance against war dangers. They would agree that he was wiser in advocating a generous expenditure, but by no means an excessive expenditure. It ought to be the first object of every hon. Gentleman to prevent annexation in every quarter of the globe, and quarrels with other countries, and to endeavour to better the position of the people of this country. He believed that that condition would never be bettered until taxation was reduced, and until the money devoted to armaments was spent in a more practical manner. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £600,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,072,000, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Sir ELLIOTT LEES (Birkenhead) said that the hon. Gentleman had expressed a view with reference to the Navy which he thought had been exploded. If they lost all the Colonies and had no Empire, they would still have to maintain their sea power and expend as much on it as they did at present. The Navy discharged very different and very much more important functions now than it did a hundred years ago. A hundred years ago the Navy was maintained as a security against invasion and as a protection for trade and the Empire. Since then they had almost imperceptibly glided into a position in which four-fifths of the population of the country depended upon seaborne food. So long as they were in that position they must maintain the command of the sea not with any desire to offend foreign nations, but because the very existence of this country depended upon it. Incidentally that gave this country power which naturally excited jealousy on the part of other nations, who saw an immense trade accruing to the country which had command of the sea. Foreign nations could not indulge in large seaborne commerce or in large over-sea empire without giving hostages to the Power which had command of the sea. That, of course, created much jealousy and ill-feeling; but so long as four-fifths of the population of this country depended on seaborne supplies, they could not afford to let any other Power compete for the command of the sea. It was not a question of a two-Power or a three-Power standard, it was a question as to the exigencies which might arise in any part of the world. He thought if it were made plain to foreign nations that it was not because of ambition or of any desire to be aggressive, but because our very existence depended upon it, that this country maintained such a vast expense in order to secure the command of the sea, and that no effort would be spared to retain it, it would do away with some of the misunderstanding and jealousy which was excited when statesmen in England discussed the needs of the Navy. Hon. Gentlemen opposite professed to be satisfied with the present fiscal system, and with the manner in which this country obtained its food. He therefore could not understand why they deprecated the maintenance of our sea power. Cobden himself said that he would sooner spend £70,000,000 on a strong Navy than see it sink to an inferior position. He did not share the fiscal views of hon. Gentlemen opposite, but he recognised that they could never hope in this country to supply anything like half of the population with food except from abroad. As long as that was the position, he hoped that only a very small minority of the House would agree with the views which had been put forward by the hon. Gentleman.

*Mr. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry) said in venturing to address the Committee on this subject he desired to express the view that there was a great difference between size and quality. They might have an overwhelming Navy in numbers; but it did not follow that it would be efficient. Efficiency was very often the opposite to size, and he thought the rapid expenditure on the Navy, so far from being a source of additional strength, was rather the contrary. Everyone who was accustomed to business knew that rapid growth of expenditure did not bring with it an equal growth of efficiency. The Navy was not in any sense a means of adding to the productiveness and wealth of the country. It was merely a question of insurance; and if they over insured they would only be weakening their own position, because the money would have to come out of the pocket of the taxpayer. Therefore, the Navy which was beyond the needs of the time, far from being a source of strength, was a source of weakness. The hon. Gentleman spoke of having a greater standard than the three-Power standard, but there must be a limit somewhere, or they would all be ruined. There was one thing connected with the new naval scheme which was very unfortunate. They were putting a number of ships on the scrap heap, but they were not obtaining an equal reduction of expenditure. The Estimates showed a reduction of £3,500,000; but that was entirely obtained by a decrease in the amount spent on building and armaments. The actual cost of the Navy itself had increased by £168,000. There were two battleships, the "Hero" and the "Conqueror," which were practically unseaworthy, and that being so he would like to know why they were kept on the list at all? They should be put upon the scrap heap. He was bound to say he thought this programme was a very disappointing one, because whilst 155 ships were taken off the effective list there was no equivalent saving obtained. He hoped in the future some attempt would be made to reduce the cost of the maintenance of the Navy.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 128; Noes, 262. (Division List No. 46.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Barlow, John Emmott
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, J. (Kilkenny, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alex. (Lanark, N.E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, V. P. (Cavan, W.)
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stanhope, Hn. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, P. (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd.
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Black.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allen, Charles P.
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J (Manch'r.)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H F (Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R
Colston, Chas. Ed. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles C. (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crooks, William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dunn, Sir William
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Edwards, Frank
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs.)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, Sir Jas. (Staffords. N. W
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. Midd., (Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N R.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Harry Hananel
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dunfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moulton, John Fletcher
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.

Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clements Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn J Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strutt, Hon Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Col. C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
White, Luke (York, E. R.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said that the statement of the Secretary to the Admiralty on the question of flogging in the Navy was not at all satisfactory. Flogging had been abolished by statute in the mercantile marine of this country, in which a far greater number of boys were employed than in the Royal Navy. Why had it not been similarly abolished in the Navy? He objected to any system under which there was the least possibility of a man with all the rights of freedom and independence of manhood being subjected to punishment by a cat-o'-nine-tails. According to the present law no King's ship could go out of port without carrying the cat-o'-nine-tails as part of her equipment. By the Naval Act of 1884 flogging in the Navy was not abolished; it was merely suspended by an Order of the Queen in Council, which could be revoked at any moment by a stroke of the pen. He altogether objected to the shameful penalty of the lash; by the very nature of the system the power was bound to be abused. Personally he had had great difficulty in believing that things as they were really existed. The punishment as defined by Article 759 of the King's Regulations was an outrage not only on the victim, but also upon the boys who were compelled to witness it. He read extracts from letters from naval officers and others describing the punishment and the "devilish skill" with which various strokes were invented with a view to making the pain more lasting. In one case two Australian naval officers who were on board were invited to witness a flogging, but they were so disgusted with what they saw that they at once left the ship. Dockyard Members might well take into consideration what boys who enlisted in the Navy from their constituencies were liable to. The frequent outrages on training ships, the attempts to burn the ships, and so on, were the result solely of this horrible system which degraded the boys and produced the feeling that they had been forsaken by God and man. It was not the case that flogging was inflicted only in rare instances. The cane was really the punishment for all offences. Last year there were 350 floggings by birch ordered by commanders *in proprio motu* and six by Courts-martial, making 356 in all. But in the Royal Navy one could be caned for every minor offence, and caning was the punishment of the day. There were about 10,000 minor offences, and he was not exaggerating when he said that at least 8,000 of those were visited by the punishment of caning.

The hon. Gentleman had said he would make inquiries. What was wanted was an inquiry into the whole system. For months he had been trying to get information from the Secretary to the Admiralty, and he had only succeeded after a cross-examination which was like taking so many drops of blood from him, and he would not now tell them what punishments were visited by the cane and the birch. The Admiralty had gone so far as to post notices in the dockyards stating that anyone who gave information on this question would be dismissed. He had asked to be allowed to see the birches, cat-o'-nine-tails, and the lashes, but he was not allowed to see them, although they were bought with public money and used upon the sons of our people. The sons of the rich were allowed to inflict this degrading punishment upon the sons of the poor, and the people of England would not stand it when they knew the facts which were being so carefully concealed. He should continue to denounce this system of flogging until it was abolished. The hon. Member said that he had not heard of a single hard case, but he knew of many cases within the last few months. He was sure they were all ready to defend poor little boys who had their lives tyrannised over by an atrocious and villainous system. A case had occurred on board the "Victory." That children should be subject to abominations of that kind was an outrage. A few weeks ago, on the "Victory," a boy was brought up for an assault upon the commanding officer, committed whilst he was witnessing one of his comrades being birched. In that case a number of boys were brought up to witness another boy receive twenty strokes with a birch rod. In an excess of emotion for his comrade who was being birched, one of the boys rushed out of the ranks and assaulted the commanding officer. That was outrageous conduct on the part of the boy, but it would not have occurred if the boys had not been brought up to see this outrageous scene. This boy was given twenty-four lashes, and that illustrated the horrors of the system. This information he got from a paragraph in *The Times*.

There could be no palliation for this system, and there was nothing in the Royal Navy which made flogging necessary. He would take precious good care to make this a public question at the coming election, and candidates would be asked whether they approved of a system whereby boys in the Navy were liable to such punishments. He had been asked by the hon. Member for King's Lynn what the offences were. He was by no means a humanitarian, and he was not opposed to the lash for abominable crimes. Men who assaulted women and committed highway robberies were proper subjects for the lash, but he did not think innocent boys, between fourteen and eighteen years of age, who happened under exceptional circumstances to irritate a commanding officer, should be subjected to this punishment, and such an infliction could not be justified. These boys were guilty of offences which were largely due to their surroundings, and they were the victims of society. Those in authority should try the effects of gentleness and kindness, and those who were not susceptible to those influences should not remain in the King's service. He was quite content to place this matter before the public in its present light. At the present time boys could be caned for almost any offence, such as smoking, having soiled tunics, not being able to swim, and being disrespectful to superiors, and boys had been known to attempt suicide for fear of these punishments. Those were everyday occurrences in the Navy. [MINISTERIAL Cries of "Oh, oh!"] On one of His Majesty's ships flogging took place upon every day in the year, and in one year there were 8,000 canings in the Navy. This system was not for the good of the boys, and commanders adopted this system of terrorism because it was easier than taking the trouble to achieve the same end by kindness and discipline. On each ship with 1,000 men on board there were frequently two or three boys in punishment cells below water-mark, where they were fed for twenty-four hours on bread and water to prepare them for punishment. If that system was not an abuse of everything that savoured of humanity or Christian principles then he was certainly mistaken.

He could not believe that every one of those who had been corresponding with him and writing to *The Times* and other newspapers about things which they had seen and heard were stating things which were not true. The system at present in existence ought not to be allowed to exist for one moment. He believed that these poor little mites were subjected to this torture and degrading ordeal for offences in respect of which a boy at school would get some trivial punishment. The question the Committee had to consider was whether they were not allowing children to have their whole lives destroyed by this treatment. He had in his hand a letter from a man who described what he had seen in the Navy. He stated that the birch used was two-and-a-half pounds in weight, that the man who applied it practised on a hammock, or anything convenient, and that flogging had been brought up to a fine art. The writer stated that he had been employed on a training ship as a messenger. On board that ship there was a big chap who used to make it a brag, when a birching was coming off, that he could with twelve strokes knock the victim insensible, and he generally did it. He further stated—

> "I would sooner see anyone belonging to me a cripple or under the earth than in the Navy, and I strongly advise all parents to keep their sons as far from it as they possibly can. Put them to anything but the Navy, for to the end of my days I will never forget those terrible times of my life in the training ship."

The hon. Member read a recruiting officer's advertisement for boys for the Navy, in which it was stated that they could be received with or without the parents' consent. Was that man still occupying the same position? He thanked the House for the attention with which they had listened to him, and he also expressed his gratitude to the Press for the support given to his protest against flogging in the Navy. He hoped the people of England would take up this matter. So far as Ireland was concerned, they would take good care that their boys did not go into the Navy. Flogging in the Army had been abolished, and he appealed to hon. Members to help in putting it down in the Navy. He moved to reduce the Vote by £500.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,671,500, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said he gathered from the speech of the hon. Member for South Donegal that he never was either birched or caned in his youth. If he had been it would have been better.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I was both.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said at all events it was quite evident that the hon. Member had never been on board a warship, and that he did not know in the least what he was talking about. He wished to refer to a point of very important detail in connection with the Mediterranean Fleet.

THE CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman is out of order in discussing the general question until we have dealt with this.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said it would be a disgrace to English Members of the House were they not to join in this solemn protest against the continued infliction of those cruelties in connection with one of the highest branches of the public service. There was no service which in his estimation was more honourable and more necessary than the Navy. In speaking thus he did not limit his remark in any degree to the superior officers. Every boy on board a fighting vessel was part of the fighting sytem, and was entitled to the same consideration and honour, and the same immunity from cruelty and oppression, as any officer or man. The hon. Member for Great Yarmouth created merriment by stating that the hon. Member for South Donegal could not have received chastisement in his youth. Let him assure the Committee that never since he possessed a leg and a foot and a pair of boots did any man living ever offer punishment to him without receiving his reward. Notwithstanding that, he submitted that he should have made a moderately efficient sailor if it had been his fortune in his youth to have had his life directed into that channel. He had no confidence whatever in punishment producing efficiency. To draw a parallel between public-school flogging and flogging in the Navy was to his mind nonsense. Every boy entering a public school went there with the knowledge that if he committed a breach of discipline punishment of some kind or another would follow. Boys were not told when they were sworn into the Navy that the cat-o'-nine-tails, birches or canes were awaiting them.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB: There is no cat-o'-nine-tails.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: There is.

MR. BROADHURST said the cat-o'-nine-tails was a suspended, and not an abolished, instrument. The Secretary to the Admiralty should face the facts as they were. He would gain no strength by trying to evade the main point at issue. A boy at a public school could be recalled at any moment on complaint by his parents if they thought he was being unjustly and too severely punished. A boy in the Navy could not be withdrawn on complaint by the parents if they thought he was being unjustly and too severely punished. To say that the two positions were similar was to talk cheap nonsense calculated to appeal to the frivolity of hon. Members, and not to deal with a serious matter in a proper way. While the boys of the poor were subjected to these degrading operations boys of the superior class in the ship were not so treated. Was there a man there who dared stand up and say that boys of the superior class were not as capable of, and as much inclined for, mischief as the others? What were the records of the Army which had brought disgrace on that branch of the service? His complaint was that the very class of boys who were subjected to this torture and indignity, the shame of which sometimes lasted through the life of a poor wretched creature, was the class least capable of making their complaints heard or bringing them under public notice. [Interruption.] This debate should really be carried on seriously; and, so far as he was concerned, he would support every effort to put an end to this degrading torture.

The Secretary to the Admiralty occupied a post of great distinction which any man might be proud to hold, but could he occupy it with analloyed pride when he knew that he was at the head of a Department which submitted weak and tender children to the mercy of incapable, ill-tempered, inefficient officers in charge of a ship? Naval officers should possess, besides fighting and flogging qualities, those of management of human nature. They should be humane, just, and capable of treating those under them as God-made human creatures entitled to the same rights and treatment as they themselves were. A man of that kind could manage a ship and its crew, including the boys, without submitting them to this degradation. Until this system of punishment was abolished, and discipline and order maintained by kindness on the part of the commanders, they would not have a Navy which carried satisfaction and pride into the cottage homes of England. [Interruption and laughter.] He had not seen a more degrading exhibition of merriment in the House for the last quarter of a century; and he was amazed that any constituency could send a Member to the House who was capable of such levity on such a serious matter. He knew he spoke with feeling, but that was because he belonged to the class from which the ships of the Navy were manned. During the last fifteen years he had signed many scores of papers swearing in the youth of his neighbourhood into the service of the British Navy. When so engaged he had always done his best to impress on the lads the virtues of discipline and sobriety. Well, he had always exercised that power to the best of his ability, and he hoped it had not been without fruit in after life if he was to judge by the progress of many of those lads who in later years visited him to report their life's work in the Navy. If the parents or guardians of boys who desired to enlist in the Navy realised that the tender flesh of their precious ones was to be subjected to laceration, either through the passionate temper or inefficiency of the ship's commander, they would hesitate a long time before they consented or encouraged their boys to enter the service. In conclusion he made an earnest appeal to the Secretary to the Admiralty to report to his superiors the full and strong feeling which existed amongst the people's representatives against the continuance of this brutality of flogging. The infamous system could be destroyed at once and for ever without the least possible danger to the discipline and efficiency of the British Navy. He believed that the Secretary to the Admiralty was himself a kind-hearted man, who lived in that part of the country which supplied some of the finest seamen in the world to the Navy and the merchant service. If the hon. Gentleman were to visit the fishing and rural villages of his own county he would find that the feeling against flogging was as strong there as he had attempted to express; and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would mark the tenure of his office by securing the abolition of this degrading punishment in the Royal Navy.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said he had already dealt with the subject, and it would be merely wasting the time of the House if he repeated his statement. If there were any proof of undue severity, or anything approaching cruelty, there would be just as much indignation on his side of the House as on the other; and it would be the manifest duty of the Board of Admiralty immediately to put an end to it. But the essential thing missing in the whole structure of vehement denunciation to which the House had listened was that there had not been a single definite authenticated case brought forward of any undue severity or any cruelty. There was neither chapter nor verse. As far as the Admiralty were aware, the punishment which took place in the Navy was exactly similar to that which took place at school. One point made was as to the weight of the birch, and an hon. Member opposite happened to possess an Eton birch, and had said that the weight of the Eton birch was equal to the combined weight of the Home Office birch and the Navy birch, even after it had suffered some loss of weight by attrition. He did not want to make a joke on a serious subject, but his point was that this was not a serious subject. It would be a serious subject if there were any undue severity or cruelty in the infliction of the punishment, but there was not, it being, in fact, but a part of the ordinary system of dealing with the youth of the country.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he did not agree with the hon. Gentleman that this complaint was in any sense or in any degree a waste of the time of the House. It was a serious subject well deserving of different consideration to that which had been given it by hon. Gentlemen opposite. The real question was whether the system of punishing boys, which now prevailed in the Navy, was a good system or not; and to arrive at a conclusion the Committee should be told exactly what the system was. There were two classes of boys in the Navy—the officer class from the "Britannia" and the seamen class from Greenwich. The discrimination between these two classes of boys in the Navy was now more strict, and therefore more indefensible, than it used to be. When he was at the Admiralty he had the opportunities of comparing the two classes of boys with respect to attainments and manners, and he declared solemnly that he could make no discrimination at all between them. He, therefore, put the Question, did the same system of corporal punishment prevail with respect to both classes of boys?

*Mr. PRETYMAN: Yes. The boys from the "Britannia" are liable to the same corporal punishment as the boys from Greenwich. The system is exactly the same as it was when the hon. Gentleman was at the Admiralty.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said it was a long time since he was a lad and the question was not raised in his time. That Answer was quite unworthy of the Question, and quite unworthy of the hon. Gentleman. The system was not to be justified or condemned because it was or was not the system in vogue ten years ago. His second Question was: by what authority, and after what sort of inquiry, was this violence administered to the boys?

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said, in his opinion the hon. Member for Donegal had brought some very serious charges against the management of boys in the Navy. It was all very well for hon. Gentlemen to laugh, but they did not laugh at such things when they were at school. He had been swished several times and no doubt it had done him good, but that was quite another matter if it was as the hon. Gentleman opposite had said. He had not the slightest doubt that the Secretary to the Admiralty believed that it was not, but the question was did he really know? He could remember very well seeing boys in private schools flogged very cruelly indeed, and he thought it was not a good way of getting out of this by saying that no case had been properly found out and proved. How was it going to be proved, who was going to see it, and who would dare to give it away? He thought they might fairly ask the Secretary to the Admiralty to make absolutely certain that nothing of the sort could possibly occur, and to see that boys should only be flogged for certain very serious offences.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthen, W.) said the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down went to the root of the question. Nobody suggested that when the Secretary to the Admiralty denied the accuracy of the charges made he was trying to mislead the House, or questioned the truthfulness of his statement. He was quite certain that what the hon. Gentleman stated he thoroughly believed. The question was whether a case had been made out for a full and impartial inquiry into the system of flogging in the Navy. They were very much indebted to the hon. Member for bringing this question forward. The hon. Member had performed a useful public service in so doing. It was perfectly idle for hon. Gentlemen to shut their eyes to the fact that there was a feeling growing up in the country that this system of flogging in the Navy was carried on to an unjustifiable extent. He had no desire to go into the merits or the details of this particular case, but merely to refer to the general aspect. His sympathy was against this form of punishment altogether, and to compare the swishings which boys received in schools with the form of punishment inflicted upon boys in the Navy was absolutely absurd. The form of punishment inflicted in the Navy was more severe than the punishment meted out to those sentenced by the magistrates under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, and it was idle and absurd to say that that punishment was the same as that inflicted on boys in our public schools.

There was one other question. The hon. Member for South Donegal had said that when he had endeavoured to see the instruments which were used for inflicting this form of punishment he was refused permission to see them. If that was so it was a very serious thing. If the hon. Member was not allowed to see these instruments he would like to know why. If, as the Secretary to the Admiralty stated, this was a proper form of punishment, why was this concealment resorted to? One would have thought that if the authorities had such an excellent case for the continuance of this form of punishment, they would have, instead of concealing it, given every possible facility to his hon. friend for seeing the instruments with which it was inflicted. Speaking upon this question, he had in his mind the flogging of boys from sixteen to eighteen years of age. He believed the age up to which a boy could be flogged in the Navy was eighteen; he thought it ought to be sixteen, but what he desired to draw attention to in speaking upon this question was that the whole tendency of our legislation was against this form of punishment. He was not going to say that for boys up to the age of sixteen it ought to be eliminated altogether. He would not for a moment put it so high as that. He remembered some years ago an hon. Member introducing a Bill into this House to legalise the punishment of flogging for men guilty of offences towards women and children. [Cheers.] Hon. Members cheered, but the House refused to accept that Bill. A full debate was held upon it, and the late Lord Ridley, then Home Secretary, said that it was a form of punishment that all official experience was against, and so far as he was concerned he would not be able to support it. Three or four years ago there was introduced a Bill dealing with the Summary Jurisdiction Act, and containing a clause by which magistrates were to have further powers to order sentences of birching for boys for certain offences. That was a Government measure, but after the debate the Government of the day had to withdraw the birching clause because the opinion of the House and of people experienced in such matters was against that form of punishment. If, therefore, it had been shown that the general tendency of legislation and of public opinion was against this form of punishment, did not the hon. Gentleman think a case had been made out for a full and impartial inquiry as to what was actually going on in the Navy? While not agreeing with everything that had been said in the debate, he thought a strong case for inquiry had been made out, and he suggested that the Secretary to the Admiralty would be rendering a great public service and doing good to the Navy by promising an impartial investigation into this matter.

Mr. MAJENDIE (Portsmouth) said there were two sides to this question. In the course of his speech the other day, the hon. Member for South Donegal made certain observations to which he, as representing a naval constituency, felt bound to take exception. He said that everybody who joined the Navy was liable to be flogged whether he deserved it or not. That was a very great aspersion to cast upon naval officers. He supposed that the hon. Member was quite aware that birching might not be administered without a warrant and that, by Clause 759 of the King's Regulations, Section 20, the punishment was to be awarded by warrant, and that on a ship carrying a flag or broad pennant the approval of the flag officer or commodore in command had to be obtained. So that the hon. Member cast aspersions, not only on other naval officers, but also on the commodores and admirals in making that statement. The hon. Member illustrated his point by one or two stories. The first was about a boy who was flogged on board the "Lion," and he said that boy fainted during the course of castigation, was brought to, and flogged again.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: That did not occur. I did not give any samples of specific flogging on board the "Lion." The case to which the hon. Member refers I repeated from a letter. I said that the boys were birched and caned for not being able to swim properly.

Mr. MAJENDIE thought, at any rate, that in one ship the hon. Member said birching took place, that the boy fainted, and was brought to and flogged again. He wished to point out that by the Regulations it was essential that a medical officer should be present, and if the hon. Member's statement was correct it would be perfectly easy to verify it and bring that medical officer to Court-martial. He believed that the letter in which this was stated was anonymous.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I know the name of the writer and could give it. As far as I am concerned the letter was given to me by a clergyman of the Anglican Church, who thoroughly believed in its authenticity.

Mr. MAJENDIE considered that if the clergyman were a humane man no doubt he would publish the letter and get the doctor tried by Court-martial. The hon. Member also stated that he knew of another boy who was birched for stealing a postal order. He thought he remembered that case. The boy stole a postal order from another poor boy on the ship. If he remembered aright the hon. Member expressed some indignation because the boy was dismissed from the service and then flogged. He thought the hon. Member was putting the cart before the horse. The probability was that the boy was first flogged and then dismissed. He would like to point out what the alternative might have been. That boy might perfectly well have been sent to prison for a term of one or two years with hard labour. Which was the more humane—to flog him there and then and to dismiss him from the ship, or to blight his life by imprisonment? As regarded caning in the Navy, hon. Members opposite said that midshipmen and naval cadets were not punished. Not long ago there was a certain amount of bullying on board the "Britannia" which was put down by the captain, who was now a distinguished admiral, instituting a system by which cadets were flogged in public before the other boys. Caning went on on board the training ship "Isis" when necessary, and he did not think the statement that it was the case of the rich flogging the poor applied at all, as flogging was administered to the rich as well as to the poor. Since last week he had had the opportunity of talking to a great many sailors of all grades in the service upon this subject, and he had not come across one who had a word to say against flogging or caning in the British Navy. They all admitted that it was necessary, and that it was far better that a boy should receive caning as a punishment than be confined to the ship, or have his leave stopped. As he had the honour of representing a naval constituency, he felt strongly that in bringing this matter forward the hon. Member had cast very serious aspersious indeed upon the honour and humanity of the Bristish naval officer, and he thoroughly and entirely repudiated them.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) said the hon. Member opposite had avoided the main point of the indictment of the hon. Member for South Donegal, and had attempted to ride off on a side issue. The question at issue was not the humanity or reputation of naval officers, but whether there existed in the Navy at the present time a practice which was abhorrent to every instinct of humanity, and discreditable to the authorities who permitted it. The Secretary to the Admiralty had not treated the matter in a manner worthy of his high office. A paymaster of the Royal Navy had written a letter declaring that it was a hateful and an abominable thing that these lads should be flogged, and stating that when he witnessed this degrading punishment he was ashamed of the uniform he wore. He contended that a conclusive case had been made out for investigation, and he hoped the hon. Member would do something to signalise the administration of his high office by granting an inquiry which would put an end to the public feeling which had been aroused. The Irish Members regarded this subject with great interest, because it recalled the early days of Mr. Parnell and the great and successful fight he made in abolishing flogging in the British Army. At that time Mr. Parnell was accused of trying to bring discredit upon the British Army and the British Empire, but he stuck to his contention, and he had the satisfaction of securing the alliance of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and between them the fight for the abolition of flogging in the Army was brought to a successful issue, and one of the greatest reproaches to the British Army was removed. He was perfectly satisfied that they were now only at the beginning of this great struggle, and however much hon. Members opposite might laugh and sneer, this fight would go on until this scandal was put an end to. At the end of this fight his hon. friend the Member for South Donegal would be looked up to as a man who had rendered a very valuable service to the cause of humanity in this country.

When the question of flogging in the Army was being considered in the House, hon. Members were given an opportunity of seeing in the House the instruments used for flogging, and he could not see why similar facilities should not be given at the present time in regard to flogging in the Navy. His hon. and learned friend the Member for South Donegal had asked that a sample of the cat-o'-nine-tails should be brought to the House for hon. Members to inspect. Why was a distinction to be made in allowing hon. Members to see the instruments used for punishment in the Army and not those used in the Navy? As far as Irishmen were concerned, the Irish Catholic bishops had issued a warning against Irish boys joining the British Navy, and the result of this debate would be to increase the determination of the Irish people to see that none of their children should enter the British Navy.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.) said that if the Secretary to the Admiralty would rise and state that in accordance with the demand from all parts of the House he would grant such an inquiry as had been asked for, he would give way and not continue the discussion.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that the Admiralty would be quite ready to investigate any case the particulars of which were submitted, but he could not admit that any case for public inquiry had been made out. He moved that the Question be now put.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 239; Noes. 161. (Division List No. 47.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope

Mr. Majendie.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundel, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manch'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Invern'ss B'ghs
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon, Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Staffords. NW
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, Hn H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. NR
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C. (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, Rt Hn J. Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.

Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. MacNeill and Mr. Joseph Devlin.

Question put accordingly, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,671,500, be granted for the said Service."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 151; Noes, 235. (Division List No. 48.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel, T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hunt, Rowland
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Seely, Maj. J E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Countenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North.
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. MacNeill and Mr. Broadhurst.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George

Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George

Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.

Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHn. Sir J. (Manch'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Forster, Henry William

Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, RtHn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (Lond'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James (Staffords, N W
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd. Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Laurence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred

Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, RtHon. Sir Frederick G.
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry

Nicholson, William Graham

Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy

Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James (Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S (Limehouse
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, RtHn J Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty

Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C. E. (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks)
Wodehouse, RtHn. E.R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Mr. Pretyman claimed, "That the Original Question be now put."

Original Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,672,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending March 31st, 1906," put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 252; Noes, 105. (Division List No. 49.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allen, Charles P.
Allhusen, Augustus HenryEden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arroll, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt Hon. SirH.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H.F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Campbell, RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, J.H.M. (DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A
Cochrane Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crooks, William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Dewar, Sir T.R. (TowerHamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt Hon.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt.Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon A. de Tatton
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, SirR.B.(Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon.Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn.J E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hamilton Marq of(L'nd'nderry)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, Sir James(Staffords.NW
Helder Augustus
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, JF.(Sheffield, Brightside)
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John(Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, SirJoseph (Monm'th)
Lawson, Hn H.L.W.(Mile End)
Lawson, JohnGrant (Yorks.NR
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwoord, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendia, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, RtHnSirH E.(Wigt'n)
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham

Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moulton, John Fletcher
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newnes, Sir George
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H C. (North'mb Tynside)
Smith, Rt Hn J Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tennant, Harold John
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C. E. (Taunton)
Welby, Sir Charles G E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
White, Luke (York E.R.)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Barlow, John Emmott
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, N.E
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph, P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, P.J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor, (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Russell, T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theordore C. (Radcliffe
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE CITY OF LONDON (ESCAPE FROM FIRE) BILL. (By Order).

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) stated that an arrangement had been come to by which this measure was to receive a Second Reading that night. The opponents of the other Bill, which was promoted by the London County Council, had agreed not to object to the Second Reading of this measure on condition that the Council, on whose behalf he spoke, withdrew all except a certain portion of it. Both parties, however, reserved full rights before the Committee which would consider the Bills. In these circumstances he did not move the rejection of the City of London Bill.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster), on behalf of the Metropolitan Unionist Members, agreed to the arrangement suggested by the hon. Member for Battersea. Part 8 of the County Council Bill would not be opposed by the London Unionist Members, who agreed that that part of the Bill, together with the City of London Bill, should be read a second time.

Mr. BIGWOOD (Middlesex, Brentford) said that this arrangement also had the consent of the other opponents of the Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed.

LONDON BUILDING ACTS (AMENDMENT BILL). (By Order).

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir JOSEPH DIMSDALE (London) remarked that on the distinct understanding that the whole of the clauses of the Bill were expunged with the exception of Part 8, Clauses 95 to 109, he did not oppose the Second Reading. The City Corporation reserved to themselves the right to take what course they deemed proper when the Bill came before a Committee of the House.

Mr. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): I have nothing to add to the statements already made.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

DISTRESS IN WEST OF IRELAND.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.) rose to call attention to the distress in the West of Ireland; and to move, "That this House is of opinion that the Government has failed in its duty in not anticipating the distress which is so prevalent in the West of Ireland, ample warning of which was given by the condition of the crops during the past two years; that the methods adopted to cope with the distress were proved by previous experience to be ineffective, demoralising, and wasteful, and that the enforcement of Clause 13 of the Local Government Act inflicts a great injustice on the poorest counties in Ireland; and that it considers it one of the first duties of any Government to make suitable provision for meeting such visitations; and that it declares that the present distress is of a preventable character, and due entirely to the unnatural conditions prevailing in the West of Ireland by which the agricultural population is banished from the good lands and compelled to live on holdings incapable of providing a decent maintenance for a family; and that it calls upon the Government at once to take all necessary action, whether of an administrative or a legislative character, permanently to remove the causes which have led to the present and previous periods of distress and famine in that part of Ireland." The hon. Member said his Amendment dealt with the state of chronic poverty to be found in Connaught and similarly situated districts, and their contention was that no such distress ought to exist; that it was unnatural and artificial, and the result of a social system which had been encouraged by the Government of this country, and was a direct result of its maladministration. To Irishmen, and particularly to those who came from the Province of Connaught, it was most humiliating to have to bring before Parliament the woes and sorrows of their people, and to have to speak of them before those who in the main knew absolutely nothing and, he feared, cared almost as little about the people. Whilst unquestionably the name of Connaught had been identified in that House, and, indeed, throughout the world, with distress, poverty, and famine, it was not because the district was poor, but it was because the people were separated from the land which by right belonged to them, and because they were driven from it by cruel laws passed by this country and by a garrison which was kept in Ireland for its subjugation.

He would first say a few words as to the present distress which, after all, was merely a little aggravation of what was chronic in the district. Two years ago there was an abnormal rainfall in the western part of Ireland, and such was its effect on the crops in the district that everybody acquainted with the facts were well aware that serious consequences to the poor must follow. The potato was the staple article of diet; it was the food on which most of the people lived, and it was almost the only article of food that had escaped the clutches of the tax-gatherer. Well, to such an extent did the rainfall affect the potato crop that many of the boards of guardians in the West of Ireland called the attention of the Irish Local Government Board to the matter and asked that power should be given to the local authorities to distribute seed potatoes in the following spring. On examining *The Parliamentary Debates* for last year it would be found that the very first Question put in the House of Commons that session was one asked by the hon. Member for North Roscommon, and addressed to the Government requesting it to take this very matter into consideration. But at that time it was an Englishman who was ruling Ireland—and he professed to know more about Ireland and more about Connaught than the inhabitants themselves, or than those who in Parliament represented the people who were suffering. Consequently they were told that the failure of the potato crop was a little figment of their imagination. It was not then suggested by boards of guardians that there was such a failure as would result in distress, but it was stated that there was such a failure as would bring about a scarcity and poverty of seed in the following spring. That prediction was justified by results, and, early in the autumn of last year, resolutions were passed by boards of guardians and other public bodies in the West of Ireland calling attention to the fact. Representations were also made to the Chief Secretary and to the Local Government Board to the effect that there was a prospect of a period of very serious distress which might almost amount to a famine in that district. Yet nothing whatever was done, and no action was taken until notice was given of a meeting of the Irish Parliamentary Party, to be held in Dublin in December last, to take the matter into consideration. On the very eve of that meeting, and not until then, a circular was issued by the Local Government Board stating that power would be conferred upon local authorities and boards of guardians to provide seed potatoes for the people in the spring. To the mind of the Irish Members and of the people of the district that was not the proper way to meet the difficulty. In the first place the money for the seed potatoes had, afterwards, to be refunded by these very poor people, and not only had it to be refunded, but interest had to be paid upon it. That was contrary to all precedent set on previous similar occasions.

Some slight steps had since been taken by the Government, under pressure from local public bodies, to provide for the temporary distress, but they were scarcely worth speaking of. One of the proposals was to put Clause 13 of the Local Government Act into operation. This was the first occasion on which it had been proposed to put it in force. The effect of the clause was to extend the powers of outdoor relief, and to extend the area of charge from the union in which the relief was paid to the entire county. It ought to be borne in mind that these districts, at the very best of times and in the most prosperous years, were poverty-stricken, and that the people found it hard even then to pay the local rates. There was plenty of evidence of that in the Blue-books, and one of the things of which the poorer parts of Ireland most strongly complained was that the rates constituted a heavy and crushing burden. Yet, in order to meet an alarming state of distress, the rates were to be added to; the people were to be called upon to repay the money which might be lent for the purchase of seed potatoes so as to prevent the inhabitants perishing from starvation, and, in addition, the Treasury were to receive full interest on the advances. Another proposal of the Government was to set up under the direction of local boards certain relief works, on which no more than one member of a family was allowed to be employed, and the maximum amount of wage which he was to be permitted to earn was one shilling for a working day of eight hours. Those were the entire proposals of the Government for meeting the distress. They were paltry in the extreme, and only had to be described in order to prove how absurd they were. After all, hon. Members on his side of the House did not feel that this distress was anything more than temporary. But they held that unless proper steps were taken such distress would recur every few years, for it was merely a step from the chronic poverty of the best of times to the misery and starvation of these extraordinary periods of trouble.

" What was the real cause of this distress? It was not the rainfall that drove the people almost to the verge of famine, it was not the failure of the potato crop, for Connaught was a province richly endowed by nature. But it was the fact that the people had been banished from the land; it was the fact that the agricultural industry was carried on under such conditions that it was impossible for it to prosper. He would give one or two illustrations. In his own constituency there was one district, the western portion of the Castlereagh Union, the land valuation of which was £25,000. Upon that no fewer than 5,000 families were seated, while adjoining it was another district, with a similar valuation, which had only 500 families upon it. Every one of the 5,000 families was engaged in the agricultural industry, while in the case of the 500 families at least one-third were herds and cottiers employed by the rich graziers. In the poorer portion of Connaught land was valued at 3s. 6d. per acre, and there were settled upon it twenty-four families per mile, whilst on the better lands, which were valued at 17s. per acre, there were only eight families to the mile. The same tale could be told of other counties in the province—60 per cent. of the agricultural population had to live upon holdings with a valuation of under £5, while 900 families had holdings valued at over £50 and comprising an area of 160,000 acres. These figures alone would show the importance of this subject—the importance of getting the people back to the land from which they had been banished by English law, and that alone was the remedy for the distress, poverty, and famine, which had been artificially created not merely by the law, but by bad administration of it. He would urge upon the members of the present Irish Government, the chief of whom he understood was over in Ireland studying for the first time the social condition of the country of which in a few days he would be as absolute a ruler as the Czar of all the Russias—he would appeal, he said, to the Irish Government to deal seriously and sympathetically with this matter. They were not asking for doles to be given out to the poor people; they were not asking for charity. All they were asking was that the land which was now almost all left to waste, the best of the land of the province, should be given back to the people and that they should have some little chance of securing a return for their industry upon their own land.

He did not propose that night to speak on the land question generally, or to go into it as it affected the western province. But it was impossible to deal with this matter of distress in the West of Ireland without referring to the causes of it as suggested in the Amendment. The existence of evil conditions had been admitted by successive Governments, and some years ago, in order to bring about an improved state of affairs, the Congested Districts Board was set up. He did not wish to find fault with the work of that Board so far as it had gone; on the contrary, the fault they had to find with it was not that its work had been bad but that there had not been enough of it. No doubt in the beginning it was reasonable enough that the Board should proceed cautiously and experimentally. But admittedly the period of experiment had long passed, and what they now asked was that the operations of the Board should go on on a larger scale and that it should not be content with merely buying small untenanted farms here and there and splitting them up, but that it should buy up large estates in the province and resettle the people upon them by taking the occupiers off their bog holdings and bringing them back to the land which could be usefully cultivated, and which would be far more beneficial to the country than having it merely occupied by cattle and sheep.

Now, the object of his Motion that night was principally to suggest a real remedy for the chronic poverty that existed, and to urge upon the Government to see that the Congested Districts Board worked more quickly than it now did. They complained that when exceptional periods of distress occurred merely old methods were adopted to meet them. They complained further that something was not done by the Congested Districts Board to purchase more land and to utilise it for the purpose of abolishing existing conditions, instead of throwing the burden upon boards of guardians who were not really a suitable authority to carry out this work. In former years when boards of guardians were called upon to do this work they were the only public bodies in existence, but now, under the Congested Districts Board, they had parish committees, while under the Agricultural Department there were county committees, and surely administrative work of this kind should be undertaken by one or other or both of those bodies. They also complained that the Agricultural Department, which was started first and foremost for the purpose of improving the agricultural industry had, although it had now been five or six years in existence, done absolutely nothing to improve or to experiment upon the potato, which was the chief article of diet of the people. While they had been carrying out all kinds of experiments and schemes with regard to cattle, horses, poultry, and pigs, they had not done one single thing to place before the people an improved seed potato. Thus they had failed in the very first duty for which they were constituted. He was there that night to indict the Agricultural Department for having failed in what was their bounden duty towards the people, and he would urge upon it that if it wished to justify its existence in the future it must devote some of its attention to this article of diet which was of so much importance to all classes of the people. That was a matter of vital necessity, and he again appealed to the Government to deal seriously, sympathetically, and quickly with this problem, not only in its temporary but in its permanent aspect, to do its best, in a broader and more generous spirit than it had adopted up to the present, to relieve the temporary distress, and, above all, to take care that, in the future, by its administration of the Land Act of two years ago, and especially by its administration of that portion of the Act which dealt with congested districts, there should be no recurrence of these periods of distress. After all, this was a matter which rested entirely with the Government; these periods of distress were not the result of bad weather, they were not the visitation of Providence, but they were the direct result of British maladministration of the country, and it was in order to prevent them that the Irish Members asked that the Land Act and the Congested Districts Boards should, in future, be administered in a wider and more generous spirit.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said the chances of the ballot which enabled his hon. friend to move this

Resolution were welcomed by him and all his colleagues of the Irish Party, not only because they knew from past experience that his hon. friend would be able to place his case ably and forcibly before the House, but because they recognised no more suitable man to move the Motion which he had now the pleasure of seconding. His hon. friend was not only a Connaught man, intimately conversant with the affairs of Connaught, but was Member for the county over a large portion of which the present distress existed, and he was therefore able to speak with authority on the matter. He had risen to second the Motion because he was anxious to emphasise this one point—that this was not merely a Connaught question. It was not merely a western or a north-western question. The distress of which his hon. friend complained affected other parts of the country. The problem with which his hon. friend had been dealing in his speech, and to which his Motion referred, was one which affected the whole country. This was the real Irish question. This was the problem which had made the Irish land wars in the past. It was this problem which had been the cause of all the strife and turmoil, the misery, crime, and bloodshed which had marked the history of the land question in Ireland, and until this problem was settled it was vain to hope that the Irish land question could be disposed of. When his hon. friend was speaking, bearing in mind the real nature of his case, knowing that the problem he was dealing with was the peace and content of Ireland, he looked round the House and counted, on both sides of the House, exactly five British Members who had considered this question serious enough for them to come and be present at the discussion. Ah, Mr. Speaker, it was the old story. When the Irish land question blazed into semi-revolt, crime, and bloodshed, then the benches of the House were crowded with Members of various Parties who came ready to denounce the violence of Irish agitators and the Irish people. But when, in a time of peace, the representatives of the Irish people came there to place in a serious and moderate spirit before the House of Commons the appalling facts of the situation, and to ask the Government of the country to take some steps to prevent starvation and famine in certain portions of Ireland, then they had an example of the knowledge of Irish affairs and of the sympathy with Ireland in the emptiness of those benches! Aye, the emptiness of the Liberal benches was as disgraceful as the emptiness of the Government benches. He maintained that this was the real Irish land question, and that until this problem was solved it was vain to hope for a settlement of the Irish land question or a general appeasement in Ireland. Until the unnatural and inhuman conditions of life amongst the peasantry of Ireland were changed, there would not be and ought not to be an end to the Irish land war.

If the Irish Land Act of 1903 failed in Connaught, it failed in Ireland. No number of sales of land to comparatively prosperous tenants in other parts of Ireland could by any possibility settle the Irish land question as long as the real seat of the disease remained untouched. Now, in 1903 when the House of Commons was seriously considering the Irish land question, no one disputed that fact. The Land Act of 1903 would never have passed, would never have been allowed by Members on these benches to be passed, except for the promises and hopes held out on the question of the restoration of the evicted tenants and the settlement of Connaught. They now knew that so far as the restoration of the evicted tenants was concerned—whether from defects in the Act, or maladministration of the Commissioners, or the action of the Executive in tying the hands of the Commissioners—the Act had failed. He was there to-night to say that so far as the western problem of chronic poverty was concerned, the Act had failed in even a more lamentable manner. The true inducements on which the Act was accepted, and on which alone the bonus of £12,000,000 was agreed to by the Irish Members had, for the time being, disappeared, and in all seriousness he said that unless steps were speedily taken by the Irish Government to remedy this condition of things they would look in vain for a settlement of the land question through the working of the Land Act of 1903. Unless a remedy was found there would not be, and there ought not to be, peace.

What was the particular complaint brought before the House by his hon. friend? Acute distress, amounting in some cases to famine, in many cases to a state of things which would lead to famine, had arisen in various parts along the western seaboard of Ireland. Now, the central fact of the situation was that that distress was not exceptional. Anyone acquainted with the West, and the North-West and the far South of Ireland knew that dire poverty was chronic in those districts and that famine was periodic. Since 1821 there had been in those districts twelve famines large and small. Millions of people had perished through starvation and fever, millions had emigrated as a consequence of these famines, and yet, after all the experiences of a century, they had still the horrible certainty that these periods of distress and famine would recur. What was the meaning of this? Some people in this country imagined that the reason was to be found in the fact that Connaught was a desert, a barren region unfit for the habitation of man. Nothing was further from the truth. Connaught was a rich province. There was in Connaught plenty of rich land sufficient to maintain more than the present population in decency and comfort. But the rich lands of Connaught looked as if some terrible visitation of nature had swept over them, and cleared them of all population. He had driven through these lands for miles and miles and miles—over rich undulating plains, showing in many parts the ancient marks of the plough-furrows, with the ruins of little villages, and of what were once happy homesteads, and so far as the eye could reach there was no single human habitation except now and again the cottage of a herd. But all round these rich grass lands of Connaught there were fringes of bog, and mountain morass and barren sea shore; and, here, on these wretched patches of land which never did and never could produce an economic rent, which were entirely unfitted for human habitation, were to be found—in full view of the rich lands from which they and their fathers had been driven in the past—a population huddled together in misery and in squalor. Three-fifths of the population of Ireland was settled on one-fourth of the land of Ireland, and that one-fourth was the poorest of the soil of the island.

How did these people live? Well, they gained a precarious livelihood by doing a little fishing and by migratory labour. These poor Irish hodmen, with which English farmers and employers were familiar, came over here to earn a few pounds and go back to their native country to pay rent for land which never did, and never could, produce an economic rent, while they trusted to the little potato patch, very often made up of soil carried on their backs for a long distance, and strewn over rock and bog, to produce their food. Why, there was in Connaught, side by side, the bane and the antidote. So long as these conditions existed, distress and poverty would be chronic, and famine would be periodic, because nothing stood between these people and famine except the potato crop, and when that happened to fail, as this last year it had, and the earnings on English fields and in English towns had fallen off, was it any wonder that all along the western seaboard there were large numbers of people suffering from acute famine? To his mind no more awful condemnation of any government was to be found in history than the fact that these conditions had been known for the last century; that the result of these conditions had been evidenced since 1821 by twelve distinct famines; and yet from that day to this no great constructive measure of statesmanship had ever been passed to remedy them, unless they spoke of the Land Act of 1903, which had proved absolutely inoperative in these districts.

To talk of these poor people purchasing land was an absolute mockery. He remembered an eloquent and sympathetic speech made by the late Chief Secretary in which that right hon. Gentleman said that for these poor people to purchase their holdings would be to stereotype agricultural slums, and that his ambition was to build up an agricultural situation in these districts on enlarged holdings which would enable the people to pay an economic rent, or, at any rate, to live in decency and comfort. The remedy was not denied by anybody. The non-economic holdings in the West of Ireland must disappear, and a redistribution be made of the land to the people. All this was recognised when they were discussing the Land Act of 1903; but they who represented those poor people were overborne by the House and the Government when they declared that the provisions of that Act were not sufficient to deal with the conditions of the western problem. They were told by the Chief Secretary that the Act of 1903 would supply a remedy, and not only was the opinion of the Irish representatives overborne, but that of the Catholic Bishops in Connaught, who, by solemn resolution, advocated more extensive powers being conferred on the Congested Districts Board, similar to those exercised by the Crofters Commission in Scotland. That advice had been entirely disregarded by the Government and the House of Commons, and he and his colleagues were there that day to tell the House, a year and a half after the Act had been passed, that it was entirely inoperative all through the western portions of Ireland. If the Land Act were working in those districts there would be no necessity for having recourse to the horrible, wretched, wasteful, and demoralising Poor Law system of outdoor relief and relief works, because there would be ample employment provided for the people in the drainage and enlargement of holdings under the schemes of settlement provided in the Act. But practically nothing had been done. Within the last few days it was said that the De Freyne Estate had been purchased by the Congested Districts Board, but apparently either that piece of good news was not capable of confirmation, or they were left entirely in the dark as to what had taken place on that estate.

He hoped the House would bear with him a few moments while he read a declaration made on this subject on March 5th by Lord Dudley, the Irish Viceroy, in order to show that the malady was understood by the Irish Government, and that the remedy was also understood. It was surely a lamentable state of things that, when the remedy was recognised, the Government still fell back in order to meet the distress on the wasteful and demoralising system of outdoor relief to keep the poor people alive. Lord Dudley said—

"There are some parts of Ireland which, I regret to say, are at the present time very far from being in a satisfactory condition. I allude to those parts of the country lying principally along the western seaboard, where the potato crop has largely failed, and where, in consequence, the population has been reduced to a state of very acute suffering and distress. Such a state of things, however, is unfortunately no new feature in the life of Western Ireland. Again and again occurrences of a similar kind have been experienced in the past, the only variation being the extent of the areas affected and the degree of the distress obtaining. But that fact only increases our anxiety at the present time. For, although we may feel assued that in the present instance, as in the past, relief in some form or another will be found for these unfortunate people, yet with every recurrence of experiences of this kind the truth is brought home more forcibly to our minds that the conditions of life in certain areas of this country are radically wrong, and that unless some great change takes place the population of these areas will be always liable to hunger and want. Now what are those conditions? I think they are, shortly speaking, these. You have in many districts of the West and North-West in this country a great number of people living on farms of very small extent and composed principally of bad land. In good years, aided by certain subsidiary sources of income, like fishing and weaving and the proceeds of migratory labour, it is just possible for the western peasant to maintain himself and his family, and to pay fixed charges on the land. But the struggle is always a very severe one, and the result is that the standard of living is always necessarily very low, indeed, more so than with any similar body of householders in Western Europe. It is impossible for these people to do any more than live a hand-to-mouth existence. They cannot practically create any reserve in cash or in kind; and consequently, when a bad year comes, they have no reserve whatever to fall back upon, and they are driven at once into a position of helplessness and dependence. Well, it is obvious that that is a state of things that cannot be allowed to go on."

Lord Dudley went on, and would the House listen to those words—

"No Government worthy of the name can shirk its responsibility in this matter, nor avoid taking action to remedy the conditions under which so many of the Irish people live. And I would remind you that temporary measures are by no means sufficient. They may stave off the difficulty for a short time, and may prevent the people actually starving, but spasmodic alleviation deals with the result and not with the cause. The root evil remains unchecked by it, and something more, something much more drastic than money grants or relief works, is required if the condition of the western peasant is to be permanently benefited. What that should be is, of course, a question on which the people of this country hold very divergent views. There are some who think that the problem is insoluble, and I have been told by men of some experience that in their view wholesale emigration is the only cure for the poverty and congestion of the West."

Really he might adopt this speech as his own, and deliver it in his own name in the House of Commons. He hoped hon. Gentlemen opposite, who represented a few seats in Ireland, and who differed so widely from him and his colleagues on Irish questions, would not make that speech the subject of an attack on the Viceroy, and demand his recall, because he had shown statemanship, ability, and a real desire to relieve the poverty-stricken people in the West of Ireland.

Lord Dudley went on to say—

"Those who advocate such a plan have certainly never recognised the first duties of statesmanship—nor can they, I think, have ever recognised what really constitutes a country's wealth. There are others who hold the view that by the development of the fishing and cottage industries a solution of this difficult question is to be found and permanent prosperity secured. But valuable as these things are as auxiliaries, I do not believe personally that they can ever be made the central means of subsistence for any more than a mere handful of the population. The great majority of these people, in my opinion, must always live upon the land, and by the land . . . . "

" . . . . Any remedy, therefore, which is to be permanent and effective must have, in my opinion, agriculture as its basis, and this involves inevitably a redistribution of the existing holdings. In other words, you must seek to cure the chronic poverty of the West by enlarging the holdings in the congested districts to an extent and size which will return a profit in good years over and above the ordinary necessities of existence, and you must obtain the space necessary for that operation by migrating numbers of families from the existing holdings in those districts to lands which are at present untenanted."

If that speech, proceeding from the Viceroy of Ireland, were an expression of the views of the Irish Government, or perhaps he ought to say the Government as a whole, for they had two Governments in Ireland, the western problem would be very easily and quickly settled. But while they had these sympathetic speeches they had also the stern fact that nothing had been done under the Land Act of 1903 to apply a permanent remedy to the evil in the West of Ireland, and that the only remedy suggested for the present distress by the Government was the old wretched recourse to Poor Law relief and Poor Law relief works, the cost of which, by a strange irony, was thrown upon the very same people for whose benefit they were started. There was one phrase in the Viceroy's speech with which he disagreed. Lord Dudley went on to say he did not think the delay in the working of the Land Act in Connaught was due to the action of the landlords; in his opinion, the Irish landlords were really willing to sell the grass lands. He was greatly amused to read an article in the landlord organ in Dublin, the *Daily Express*, next day in which the Viceroy was denounced in a most vigorous manner for the speech he had made.

The first alarm of the threatened distress was raised by some English and American newspapers, and after a thorough investigation into the truth of the allegations the Irish Party held a meeting in Dublin in December and laid before the Government their proposals for a remedy both immediate and permanent. They called on the Government to apply the provisions of the Land Act to the West of Ireland, so far as that was possible without further legislation, and pending further legislation—because they all recognised further legislation would be necessary in order to break up the grass lands of Connaught—they recorded their conviction that the proper remedy for the immediate needs of the people was not charity, but the starting of works of permanent utility to the district. They recommended that the Estates Commissioners should have power to pick out estates in the West of Ireland and give them priority in sales, and also that they should be allowed to go on buying those congested estates in the West no matter how much money was engaged for purchase in other parts of Ireland. The third suggestion was that money should be placed at the disposal of the Congested Districts Board for remunerative works. Until these recommendations were taken up by the Irish Party, the Government did not stir a hand. But as soon as the Irish Party called attention to the matter a proposal was made by the Government, not to adopt any of these recommendations, but to have recourse once more to the system of charitable doles and of relief works. But the Irish people did not ask for charitable doles; they asked that they should be given useful and remunerative work. They believed that this system of Poor Law relief was wasteful, extravagant, and intensely demoralising; and as to the relief works, the *Irish Times* had aptly reminded them of the roads leading nowhere, and the piers that gave no protection which had been constructed in the past. The whole affair had been muddled and mismanaged. Instead of entrusting the work of immediate relief to the Congested Districts Board, which was able to deal with it, the Government had entrusted it to four different boards—the Congested Districts Board, the Local Government Board, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Works. The result had been, as always in the past, general confusion, the over-lapping of duties, waste, extravagance, and inefficiency. No greater proof could be adduced of the breakdown of Irish Government. To-day, for the twelfth time since 1821, famine had reappeared in Ireland; and the Government had nothing to offer except the old hateful, demoralising system of outdoor relief, to be paid back in better times by the very people who received it. This state of things was cruel and infamous, and showed that British rule in Ireland was not only unconstitutional, but was abhorrent to humanity.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House is of opinion that the Government has failed in its duty in not anticipating the distress which is so prevalent in the West of Ireland, ample warning of which was given by the condition of the crops during the past two years; that the methods adopted to cope with the distress were proved by previous experience to be ineffective, demoralising, and wasteful, and that the enforcement of Clause 13 of the Local Government Act inflicts a great injustice on the poorest counties in Ireland; and that it considers it one one of the first duties of any Government to make suitable provision for meeting such visitations; and that it declares that the present distress is of a preventable character and due entirely to the unnatural conditions prevailing in the West of Ireland by which the agricultural population is banished from the good lands and compelled to live on holdings incapable of providing a decent maintenance for a family; and that it calls upon the Government at once to take all necessary action, whether of an administrative or a legislative character, permanently to remove the causes which have led to the present and previous periods of distress and famine in that part of Ireland."—(*Mr. Hayden.*)

*MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara) said his hon. friend in introducing his Motion remarked that it was humiliating for Irish Members to be referring so constantly to Irish distress, but he ventured to say that the humiliation should be altogether on the other side—on the side of those who were responsible for the management and control of Irish government and administration. For undoubtedly the distress to which they drew attention was the direct result of the British government of Ireland. His hon. and learned friend who seconded the Motion had dwelt so ably and exhaustively with this aspect of the question that he should not dwell upon it to any extent. It was true that they on those benches and their people at home, and indeed throughout the world, had a deep sense of humiliation whenever they raised this question of Irish poverty and distress; but they also felt the strongest resentment and indignation when they remembered that all this poverty and distress was directly due to British misgovernment. The state of affairs in the West of Ireland to-day sketched out by his hon. friends was the greatest condemnation of the Act of Union and a vindication and justification for their efforts to obtain the management of their own affairs in an Irish Parliament. "Distress in the West!" Why, it was the regular thing! There was always distress there, and distress would ever be there so long as England ruled Ireland in opposition to the will and aspirations of the Irish people, and, at all events, so long as the conditions that caused distress remained. It was to appeal to the House once more to hearken to the cry of these poor people and to urge upon hon. Members the necessity and the wisdom of taking the earliest opportunity to grapple with this western problem that they had brought this Motion forward to-night.

The conditions under which the people on the Western sea-board of Ireland lived were a disgrace to humanity, a disgrace to our Christian civilisation, a disgrace and a condemnation of British rule. What were these conditions? He could speak for the people of Connemara with absolute knowledge, for he had known every spot of it from his boyhood. There were some 50,000 or 60,000 human beings in his constituency, and these poor people had a constant struggle from childhood to the grave—with absolute want and privation. But this House heard their cry, and heard that imperfectly, only when the potato crop had failed, as it did last year. He was well aware of the kindly and indeed sympathetic feeling that animated many Englishmen with what they were pleased to call the "Sister-Country," and he was convinced that if the British people thoroughly understood the actual condition of these western people they would support any Government that would thoroughly tackle the problem and find a solution for it. But the English people were ignorant of the causes of Irish discontent, and Party politics in this House and this country did not tend towards a radical cure of Irish ills. They and their cause were made the shuttlecock of British political Parties and nothing was ever done by way of remedial legislation until they had a seething agitation in Ireland, or until it suited the exigencies of Party warfare to do something—something always ineffective—for Ireland. He should like to know how many of their rulers—how many Unionist statesmen, or Liberal statesmen for the matter of that, visited Ireland and studied the conditions of the people for whom they undertook to legislate? Except the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General, what man on that front bench had gone over to see for himself how the people lived? Ireland might be 5,000 miles away as far as any of these Gentlemen on either side of the House cared. Although his hon. friend had proved the existence of distress and dealt with its cause and cure he would like, with the indulgence of the House, to read an extract or two from an article which appeared last month in the *Daily Mail* from the pen of the hon. Member for Southwark, who, in company, I believe, with the Lord-Lieutenant, paid a visit to Connemara some few months ago. The hon. Gentleman, who sat on the Unionist side of the House described the character of the people and their wretched dwellings. He wrote—

> "Imagine uncountable rocks and stones, stones and rocks without colour and without pity. Imagine immeasurable acres of bog, the red bog where the snipe congregate, as for public worship, at the full of the moon. And imagine somewhere away and beyond these things, above kindly or angry meres, and beyond the sound of running waters, the most tender and gentle blue mountains you ever saw.
>
> "This is Connemara, very seeming-sad and very poor among the nations. She often veils her face, she often weeps. But sometimes she smiles; and that light of her smile is as the light in the eyes of the dark Rosaleen.
>
> "And as with the mother earth, so with her children. In the unceasing melancholy and almost agony of their outward life, you shall still find the magic and the mystery and the smile of the soul. You shall find tired beings, starving bodies, and minds illiterate, legend-lore.
>
> "Come with me into the first cabin of the first village. "There is no window. There may or may not be a chimney. There is no floor but hollowed mud. There may or may not be a heap which forlornly calls itself a bed. What you would call tables or chairs are improbable. But your fellow-creatures and your fellow-subjects, within twenty-four hours of your London house—these at least will not fail you, two or four or eight or ten or twelve or more of them, excluding the livestock. One or two or three, it is true, may be sick of mind or body, but there they are, your ten or twelve, in a foulness of squalor indescribable, and answerable, not to their fault, but yours, and branding upon your soul a horror and a terror and a shame for yourself and your country which you shall never till you die forget.
>
> "And this is neither exaggeration nor exception. In many districts of the West you will find hundreds of one-room cabins with from one to more than twelve inhabitants. You will find their dwellers courteous and welcoming, children not of this world, almost happy.
>
> "But I pray to God that you will be as utterly ashamed of yourself as I was when find them you do. And the sorrow and pathos of it is that the fault is not theirs. Emigration is the uttermost extravagance that any nation can commit, and we have emigrated half Ireland in fifty years. That is, we have bred and given away to others the very stuff that makes both wealth and wars.
>
> "But I am not writing politically. It were the veriest impertinence for a tourist, however sympathetic, to seek to solve the so-long insoluble. Remedies uncountable are marketed on platforms and in council chambers. Shall the great and profitable grass lands of Ireland

be broken into small holdings to house a people who have never had the chance to till ?

The House will forgive me for quoting at such length, but I was anxious that the views of a Unionist Member, who has recently been in the West of Ireland, should be expressed in this debate. His graphic description of the conditions of life in Connemara is not exaggerated, and the House will perceive that he throws the blame for this state of affairs on the right shoulders, namely, upon the English people and upon this House.

One word in conclusion. He would like to refer to the method adopted by the Government to deal with this distress in the West, which was admitted on all hands. Indeed, he really believed it would be better for these poor people had they not been relieved than that they should be relieved by the methods at present adopted. In reply to a Question of his on the Paper he was supplied by the Attorney-General with a table showing the number of persons relieved in the Clifden and Oughterard Unions in his constituency. What was the position in Clifden ? 157 persons at 1s. a day making £7 17s. per day, while four supervisors, four paymasters, and ten gangers or timekeepers received £15 per week—an altogether disproportionate amount. In Clifden 394 men were employed on works at 1s. a day or £19 14s., while five supervisors, two paymasters, and sixteen gangers received £19 per week. Fancy 1s. a day, 6s. a week, to a poor family of eight or ten persons, as described by his hon. friend the Member for Southwark, while the supervisors and daymasters were paid £2 and £3 per week for their work of selecting the deserving cases. The whole thing was a fraud and a sham, and he was convinced that the net result of this generous and magnanimous attempt on the part of the Irish Government was that the people would be demoralised, and their last condition would be worse than their first. What was the *modus operandi ?* The supervisor, paid £2 or £3 a week and travelling expenses, visited the hovels of these people—counted how many hens they had, how many beasts they possessed, how many potatoes they had left from last year's crop, and so on, and if they found any hens, cattle, pigs, or potatoes, they were excluded from the privilege of earning 6s. a week on these works intended for their relief. The thing was a farce, and the only persons who benefited from this "relief" were the supervisors, paymasters, and gangers, who were not in distress at all. This process of differentiation between the deserving and the undeserving cases was utterly unreliable, and was calculated to do great unjustice to many of the most deserving. The fact that a man had some cattle and sheep was no evidence whatever that he was not starving or on the verge of starvation, because he (Mr. O'Malley) was aware from actual knowledge that in almost every case in Connemara, the cattle and sheep and even the eggs to be laid were mortgaged to the shopkeeper who gave credit and thus enabled the poor people to pull through in those exceptionally trying times ; and therefore he submitted that this counting of cattle, pigs, or hens was misleading and fallacious in the extreme.

The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had laid great stress, and properly so, on the failure of the Land Act of 1903 to deal with the western problem. He (Mr. O'Malley) was one of those who had such hopes of the beneficent effects likely to accrue from that Act that in public meetings in his constituency, after the passing of that Act, he urged, as strongly as he could, the advisability of the young girls and young men remaining at home rather than emigrating to America or other countries. He hoped that the Estates Commissioners would take steps to purchase the properties in Connemara and create economic holdings by the enlargement of the present wretched uneconomic holdings. But his hopes and the hopes of his constituency were not destined to be realised, and to-night, eighteen months after the passing of that Act, they were discussing the distress, and the young people were still flying the land. In conclusion, he appealed to the Government and to the Unionist Party, who claimed to be able to remove Irish grievances, seriously to consider this question, to make a speedy and generous effort to settle once for all this western problem, and thus to change a poverty-stricken, discontented, and much wronged peasantry into a happy, prosperous, and contented people.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) said the Resolution dealt with the West of Ireland, but the speeches which had been delivered had ranged far afield. The congestion of the West of Ireland was no new question. Everybody admitted it. But everybody who tried to find a practical means of solving the problem must almost be appalled by the difficulty of carrying out any scheme in practice. Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to forget that the first person who attempted practically to remedy the congestion was the present Prime Minister. With all their connection with the Liberal Party from 1832 downwards, and with all their control of the Liberal Party in modern times, it was not until 1891 that a practical means was provided for the relief of the misery which he admitted existed, and that means was provided without the aid and despite the opposition of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He did not intend to go back and discuss the historical causes or reasons for the existing condition of affairs. To a great degree that would be a waste of time. It was a practical matter which invited and necessitated practical treatment. Things being what they were, it was not within the power of man to devise a sudden remedy. That proposition could be proved by reference to the Report of the Congested Districts Board, which was not a Government Department, which had abundant funds at its disposal and ample credit, and he would call attention to what that Board said as to the advances it had made and the enormous difficulty of dealing with the problem. He could not at all accept the view of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford as to the possibility of their having been able to bring about since the passing of the Land Act a state of things which would have rendered the recurrence of famine impossible, nor could he agree that if a famine did occur the Government should be relieved of the responsibility of providing temporary relief as well as a permanent remedy.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said he had made neither of the suggestions referred to

Mr. ATKINSON: I understood the hon. Member——

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I am not responsible for your understanding; I simply state the fact.

Mr. ATKINSON said he understood the hon. and learned Member to say that temporary measures were desirable. But no matter at what rate the Congested Districts Board or the Government proceeded in the matters of migration and the redistribution of land, it would be necessary to provide for the relief of temporary distress whenever it might occur.

But to come to the actual condition of affairs. He traversed the assertion that the Government had neither anticipated the distress nor taken means to ascertain its character and the remedies by which to meet it. Up to 1891 the periodical famines were met solely by doles, grants, or loans, which did not permanently affect the condition of the people, but were, in themselves, demoralising and, to a great extent, useless. In 1891, for the first time, the Prime Minister devised means which, whether adequate or not, were designed to do a great deal for the permanent improvement of the people. The Congested Districts Board was created to deal with congested districts, and the distress was now confined to congested districts, or counties containing congested districts. During that period £1,200,000 had been spent by the Congested Districts Board in the congested districts, principally in Mayo, Galway, Kerry, and Donegal. In addition to that there was the great scheme of railway construction which his right hon. friend instituted, under which railways were made in Connemara, Donegal, and other parts of Ireland, thus opening up the country and providing means of bringing the produce to market. In addition to that, attempts were made to improve the breed of cattle and pigs, to assist the fisheries, and to establish home industries. In Clifden alone the spring fishing last year realised £6,000. The happy result of all these efforts to give the people employment and make them self-supporting was that in 1891 twenty-three unions were affected by famine, in 1895 fourteen unions, in 1889 only eleven unions, and this year only six unions. Surely that was a vast and encouraging progress in twelve years. Moreover, the Congested Districts Board, between 1893 and 1903, had purchased altogether for the enlargement of holdings 193,212 acres of land. During the past twelve months they had purchased 45,611 acres and were in treaty for the purchase of fifteen other properties, containing about 35,000 acres. If those purchases were carried out it would mean that 80,000 acres would have been purchased in the two years since the passing of the Land Act.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.) asked how much of that land had been distributed amongst the people.

MR. ATKINSON said that on page 13 of the Report of the Congested Districts Board would be found a table giving particulars of the farms and the migration which had been effected. Then, too, 17,871 acres of untenanted land had been purchased in the year, which compared even more favourably with the results of the previous eleven years, during which only 40,000 were bought. He submitted, therefore, that it could not with any fairness be said that, so far as the Congested Districts Board was concerned, the Land Act had been a failure. At all events, under the two heads, nearly 250,000 acres of land had been acquired for apportioning out amongst the people, and that must have tended to improve the condition and increase the comfort of the classes affected.

AN HON. MEMBER asked how much of the 45,000 acres purchased last year had been apportioned amongst the people.

MR. ATKINSON said he had simply quoted from the Report. The land was for distribution, whether they had yet succeeded in distributing it or not. On page 15 there was a full statement showing that 647 holdings had been enlarged and 166 new holdings created.

AN HON. MEMBER: That land was not purchased within the last twelve months.

MR. ATKINSON said the Report was for the year ending March, 1904.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That is before the Act was passed.

MR. ATKINSON said the Report dealt also with a matter which hon. Gentlemen opposite had not fairly considered, in connection with the consolidation of holdings and migration. The Board pointed out that it was enormously difficult to induce a man to give up any of his land in order to enlarge the holding of his neighbour, and that it was equally difficult to get a man to migrate to another district and to go among strangers, who very often received him with anything but welcome. That Report was open to other hon. Members as well as himself if it was thought he had not put the proper construction upon it.

Complaint had also been made that the Local Government Board had not taken adequate measures to relieve the distress. The Local Government Board, as the authortity which had to put into force the Act for the relief of distress, could not be expected to bring about a state of things in which persons in distress would be as well off as they were before the distress occurred. To do so would destroy all self-reliance and would debauch and debase the whole population. The practice of the Board was to obtain half-yearly accounts of the agricultural outlook of the country, and of the state of the crops in each district. In June it appeared from the ordinary normal report that the crops along the western seaboard were somewhat in arrears, and two inspectors were immediately appointed. Each district was examined, and special reports were forwarded in October. The Local Government Board at once proceeded to deal with the condition of things revealed in those reports, and the Treasury made a loan, estimated at the time at £60,000, to provide seeds. Hitherto the interest of 3½ per cent. on such loans had been paid out of the Church surplus; but that surplus had recently been transferred to the Board of Agriculture The interest would not amount to more than £5,000, because the loan would only last for a couple of years; but the Board made a grant out of its own funds of

£10,000, so that the seed fund this year would be richer by £5,000 than it would have been had the old method been followed. As to the relief of distress in the six districts affected, Section 13 of the Act of 1898 provided that where a board of guardians satisfied the county council that exceptional distress existed in a district and the council applied to the Local Government Board that body might, if it thought fit, authorise the guardians, subject to prescribed conditions, to administer relief. Under that Act seven unions communicated with the Local Government Board. They were not left to bear the burden themselves. On the contrary, in six of the seven districts the Government would bear a large proportion of the rate—in five cases amounting to 75 per cent. Consequently, only 25 per cent. of the amount necessary to relieve distress would fall on the county and union combined, that was, 12½ per cent. upon the county, and 12½ per cent. upon the union. Therefore, the Government were taking upon themselves three-fourths of the relief, leaving only one-fourth to be borne by the county at large and the district. It might be asked why the Government should not bear the whole expense. The answer was that when relief was given entirely out of Government funds everybody sought to exaggerate the distress and obtain as large a sum as possible. It had also been said that it would be more rational if money were given to these men to improve their own holdings; but in dealing with public money that could not be done. It was necessary to undertake work which would be for the general benefit of the community. To pay a man one shilling per day to improve his own holding was making him a present at the expense of his neighbours, and they could not pursue a plan of that kind with money provided on the principle of the Poor Law. There was a general idea in the country, and it had found expression in this House, that it was the duty of the Local Government Board to give one shilling per day to every man who was willing to come and work.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Why do you think that idea is prevalent?

Mr. Atkinson.

Mr. ATKINSON said that he was informed that that was the idea prevalent in the country, but the Government were obliged to apply some test.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: You are fighting shadows.

Mr. ATKINSON said they were obliged to make inquiries to find out whether a man really was in poor circumstances. The amount he had mentioned was by no means too heavy a burden to be thrown on the rates, which in the different districts only amounted to from 2s. 7d. to 3s. 6d. in the pound. He thought it was only fair and right to endeavour to defend a Government Department who were doing their very best in these most difficult circumstances to meet this passing and exceptional distress.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: It is not exceptional.

Mr. ATKINSON said it was three or four years since it happened before. He agreed that in regard to the help given to industries such as fishing and improvement of stock much good had been done in the congested districts. Undoubtedly it had been recognised from the very first that the permanent remedy was to endeavour to put agriculturists in farms large enough to maintain them out of their own industry; but he did not think the enormous difficulties in the way were fully appreciated. For instance, in the case of Belmullet, there was no land near which was suitable for the purpose of migration. [A NATIONALIST Member: There are thousands of acres there.] That was not the information which had been conveyed to him. He was informed that near Belmullet there was not sufficient land suitable for the migration of these poor people. But assuming that there was, the difficulty was that, in the first place, if they succeeded in getting land they must be prepared to transport the families, set them up, and give them a considerable grant to build a house and farmstead, and he understood that the Congested Districts Board found they could not put a man into a holding at a less cost than £400 odd. He was sure everybody would admit that the Board were doing their utmost to cope with the problem. This was not a problem which could be solved very quickly, and it must be approached with great patience and energy. It required time, and it was absurd to expect that this evil could be cured in a few years.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: You have had 100 years at it.

MR. ATKINSON said it was said that the solution was to be found in giving the Board compulsory powers. That remedy had been discussed over and over again. It was proposed during the passage of the Land Act of 1903, but he could not remember that any great effort was made to secure it, and no Amendments in this direction were insisted upon or pressed.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) pointed out that Amendments to secure compulsory powers were not pressed because the Chief Secretary declared that they would not be necessary under the Bill.

MR. ATKINSON said that no doubt his right hon. friend thoroughly believed that.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that the Attorney-General's memory on that point must be extremely short. Upon the First Reading, the Second Reading, and the Third Reading of the Land Bill he himself declared that the Bill would be a failure without a clause providing for compulsory powers. They proposed Amendments to that effect, and they only withdrew them because the Chief Secretary assured them that in his belief they would be unnecessary, and if the late Chief Secretary had been present, he presumed that he would now take up the position that apparently they were necessary at the present time.

MR. ATKINSON said that at any rate the Amendments upon that point were not pressed.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: They were not divided upon.

MR. ATKINSON said he called pressed being divided upon. The late Chief Secretary did say that he thought they would be unnecessary, and no doubt he thought so still. The fair inference from what had gone on during the last few years was that such Amendments would be unnecessary. Considering the short time the Land Act had been in operation and the large quantity of land that had been acquired in that short period, it was unreasonable to conclude that compulsory powers were necessary to carry out a policy which everybody desired to carry out and everybody recognised to be a sound and real remedy. He denied that the Government were to be blamed for not coming forward with legislation to confer compulsory powers to do what could be done by the provisions of a Land Act already in force.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said they had been raising this question of the congested districts for the last quarter of a century, during which period he had had the honour of a seat in that House, and although he admitted many of the things which the Attorney-General had said, he still believed that, even according to the Attorney-General's own sanguine anticipations, half a century would have to elapse before, at his own rate of progress, the problem now being discussed was adequately dealt with. The Nationalist Members and the Attorney-General for Ireland were at issue as to the facts concerning the availability of land. The Attorney-General said that there was no land available in Belmullet, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman was an Irishman well acquainted with the condition of his country. But his hon. friend the Member for Mayo declared that there were thousands of acres of land available at Belmullet, and that he himself had walked over the land. Here they were at issue upon a direct and momentous question of fact. Who was to judge between the Attorney-General and the Irish Members? Why, the English Members, about twenty of whom had entered the House within the last hour, and about five of whom had honoured them with their presence during the whole debate. It was upon the ignorance of English Members that this question would have to be decided. English Members who were ignorant of the facts, and most of whom had been absent during the debate, would have to decide between them. This was a state of things which filled Irishmen with disgust and despair. When the Attorney-General for Ireland claimed for the Prime Minister the credit for being the first to deal with the congested districts problem, it was characteristic of the whole method in which Irish politicians were treated. The Irish representatives conducted an agitation for years, and in some cases they were condemned to penal servitude or long terms of imprisonment. When the terms of penal servitude had expired the gentlemen who had suffered were removed from the plank bed to these benches, and then an English politician got up and proposed a measure which he passed into an Act of Parliament. They had a Land Act called the Ashbourne Act, but it ought to be called the Parnell Act. Now they had an Act called the Balfour Act, forgetful of the many Irishmen who had suffered in order to make it easy for an English representative to pass that Act.

The Irish Members complained of the slowness with which the problem in the West was being carried forward. The hon. Member for Waterford had pointed out that when the Land Bill of 1903 was going through there were two main conditions on which they based their support of it. The first was the restoration of the evicted tenants, and they knew how that had been dealt with. The second was the settlement of the problem of the West, and so far as that was concerned the Land Act had been a flagrant and a shameful failure. The Attorney-General had stated that there were actually 647 new holdings. He acquitted the Attorney-General of any desire to deceive the House, but the right hon. Gentleman gave the House the impression that these new holdings had been created since the passing of the 1903 Act—in the course of the twelve months which had elapsed since that Act came into operation. Their complaint was that the Government were not applying to the distress and congestion the proper remedy—the remedy on the promise of which they got their Land Act, namely, the enlargement of holdings. So long as this remedy was not applied, distress in Ireland would recur with almost the same regularity as in time past. Of the 647 holdings to which the Attorney-General had referred, 416 were on the Dillon Estate which was purchased by the Congested Districts Board six years ago. There was no exceptional distress on the Dillon Estate now. Neither the union in which it was situated, nor the British Treasury, was called on to give a penny in order to relieve distress there. That was because the estate had been sold to the tenants, and because holdings had been enlarged there. This beneficient result had occurred on an estate where, up to six years ago, there was almost typical example of distress and poverty in Ireland. The representatives of Ireland wanted other estates in Ireland treated in the same way as the Dillon Estate. The Attorney-General had stated that a great deal had been done during the past twelve months in the way of enlarging holdings. Here was a question of fact on which Gentlemen who were absent from the House would vote when the division bell rang, although they were absolutely ignorant of the condition of Ireland. The Motion before the House declared—

> "That the methods adopted to cope with the distress were proved by previous experience to be ineffective, demoralising, and wasteful."

Was there a single man acquainted with the realities of Irish life who did not believe that to be true? The *Irish Times* had only stated what every Irishman knew when it said that Ireland was covered with monuments of British folly in connection with attempts to deal with the problem of distress. Of course, if they deprived Irishmen of the full responsibility they ought to have in the expenditure of their own money they would have wasteful and demoralising results. The present system of government in Ireland was as bad for England as it was for Ireland. It threw a burden on England which ought to be borne by Ireland and which Ireland was willing to bear. Was it not plain and palpable to any man who approached this question with anything like an open mind that these Irish problems could only be dealt with by Irish intelligence and by Irishmen themselves?

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL, Dublin

University) said that after the characteristic speech of the hon. Member for the Liverpool Division it was well to recall the House to the actual terms of the Motion they were discussing. It began with the following statement—

> "That this House is of opinion that the Government has failed in its duty in not anticipating the distress which is so prevalent in the West of Ireland, ample warning of which was given by the condition of the crops during the past two years; that the methods adopted to cope with the distress were proved by previous experience to be ineffective, demoralising, and wasteful, and that the enforcement of Clause 13 of the Local Government Act inflicts a great injustice on the poorest counties in Ireland."

What were the facts in regard to this alleged prevalent distress? Out of all the unions in the West of Ireland only fifteen had suggested that there was anything unusual in the condition of the people owing to distress existing; and, of these fifteen, in only seven cases had the county councils, in response to representations from the guardians of the different unions, asked the Local Government Board to put into operation the provisions of Section 13 of the Local Government Act of 1898. He would like hon. Members to clearly understand what was the position in regard to this matter before the passing of the Act of 1898. Prior to the passing of that Act there had been what they all knew with pain and regret, recurrent periods of distress in the congested districts on the west coast of Ireland, and successive Governments had tried to meet it in a temporary way by what might be called charitable doles. These had turned out to be ineffective. They gave temporary relief, but led to wasteful administration, and they also led to a great temptation to exaggerate any recurrence of distress. In the first place funds were provided freely by the Government, and as the local authorities paid no interest on the money they had a direct interest in having these funds for relief periods as large as possible.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) said that interest was charged in his constituency at the rate of 5 per cent. per month, which amounted to 60 per cent. per annum. The money received from the Treasury was paid back.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he was not speaking of loans. He was talking of relief by free grants from the Treasury. These were undoubtedly open to two objections. In the first place the administration was wasteful, and in the second place they were a direct incentive and a direct temptation to the inhabitants of those districts to raise the cry of famine in subsequent years. Experience showed that some remedy was required which would operate by way of a check in promoting, so far as possible, wise administration in the locality, and also, so far as possible, preventing the recurrence of this demand every few years. In 1898, antecedent to the passing of the Local Government Act of that year, the Government of the day restricted the free grant to 75 per cent. of the total amount required. That was to say, of the total amount required 75 per cent. was given as a free grant, and the balance had to be provided for by loan at interest, and that experiment was of such a character that in the Act of 1898 Section 13 was inserted with the approval of all Parties in the House. The object was that in future years in cases of exceptional distress the guardians in the district where the distress existed were to make a representation to the county council, which was then at liberty to put in action the special powers of this section on the terms that one-half of the burden was to be defrayed by the county council out of the county rates, and the other half defrayed by the district where the distress existed. Prior to December last year, the Local Government Board, through its inspectors, were led to anticipate that there would possibly be a failure, partial or total, of the potato crop in the congested districts, and remedies were adopted for the purpose of meeting the distress. If the Government had rested content with the provisions of the Act of 1898 it would have been left to the county council, and the district in which the distress existed, to provide out of their own resources the entire amount necessary to deal with this distress. Supposing that in the county of Mayo £10,000 was required to meet the anticipated distress, one-half of that would have to be provided by the county at large, and the other half by the union in which the distress actually existed. But so far from relying on the provisions of Section

13, the Government went out of their way in December last to inform county councils that notwithstanding that provision they would in every county in which there was exceptional distress pay up to 75 per cent. of the total expenditure, leaving only 25 per cent. to be divided between the county at large and the particular district. But they did not stop there. The Government also said in December last, "We are going to introduce a Bill to enable loans to be raised to procure seed in those districts which, owing to the failure of the potato crop, may in 1905 have a difficulty in providing seed for themselves; and we will allow you to anticipate, in view of the passing of a Bill which we are going to introduce this session, by borrowing to the extent of £60,000 at 3½ per cent. interest, such interest to be provided by a free grant of £10,000, from the Agricultural Department, which is a sum more than twice sufficient to repay it." He therefore submitted that the terms of the Motion were not justified in so far as they described this as "prevalent distress" in the West of Ireland, it being only distress partially caused when the early spring crops of potatoes were damaged by severe weather. Apart from that question he submitted with great confidence that the Government had taken large and generous steps to remedy the evil; that it was not guilty of the indictment contained in the strong terms of the Motion, terms which contrasted with the very temperate and moderate language used by the hon. Member who introduced it.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 144; Noes, 192. (Division List No. 50.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander (Lanark, NE
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Johnson, John
Jones Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent, P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N
Mooney, John J.
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor, Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters (N Dorset)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J (Manc'r.)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Willam Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir R. B. (Inv'rn'ss B'ghs)
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Masrhall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'ndery
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, Sir James (Staffords. N W
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, F'versham
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, Hn. H. L. W. (Mile End)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut. Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles Liverpool
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Marks, Harry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, Hon. J Scott (Hants.)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint. Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Frnest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C. (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk

Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt. Hon.JG(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt.-Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

PEACE COMMISSIONERS IN IRELAND.

MR. P. A. McHUGH (Leitrim, N.) moved for a Return setting forth the names and addresses of all persons who have been committed to unlimited terms of imprisonment for Contempt of Court in Ireland to the 31st day of December, 1904; the names of the Judges who issued the orders of attachment; the charges against the persons attached; and the duration of imprisonment in each case in which the order for attachment was executed (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 145, of session 1902).

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) objected.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Does not the hon. Member require to state the ground of his objection?

*MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker Peel and myself have several times stated that objections ought not to be taken to Motions for Returns simply on the ground that it is after twelve o'clock. In every case in which we have said that, the advice we have given has been acquiesced in, and no division has been challenged. But the other evening there was an evident intention, when an objection was taken, to challenge a division. If a division is challenged I can do no more—the matter must be postponed because a division upon it cannot be taken after twelve o'clock. If a division is challenged I am powerless. I desire to express my extreme regret, if the House will allow me, in the interests of the House, and in particular in the interests of the Opposition of the day, that objection should be taken to the Government's giving information which it is ready to give at the request of hon. Members, to Members for the benefit of the whole House. I should be very glad to find there was a cessation of objections of this kind, and a return to that spirit of toleration and good sense that has hitherto characterised the proceedings of the House in matters of this kind.

MR. P. A. McHUGH: May I ask the representative of the Irish Government, if there is a representative of the Irish Government in the House, whether they object to this Return?

*MR. SPEAKER: I understand that it is an unopposed Return so far as the Government is concerned, but that does not prevent any hon. Member from objecting as I have explained.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN: Under the circumstances I am bound to insist on my objection, and, if necessary, I shall be obliged to divide.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I would ask the hon. Member to withdraw his objection.

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot help thinking that if there was a mutual understanding on both sides in regard to Motions for unopposed Returns there would be no objection to allow them to pass after twelve o'clock.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I may be allowed to say that where a Return is asked for and is not opposed by the Government I do not think objection ought to be taken, and so far as I and my colleagues are concerned we take no objection to any unopposed Return.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN: I do not wish to take any unreasonable objection. An objection was taken a few nights ago to an unopposed Return from the other side. Now there must be a mutual understanding that, if the objection to this particular Return is withdrawn, unopposed Returns are not to be objected to after twelve o'clock on other occasions.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: It must be understood that in what I have said I have only spoken for my friends and myself.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): It would be a great pity, after Mr. Speaker has given advice to the House at large, if the House did not arrive at a mutual understanding. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Leader of the Irish Party opposite has made a declaration on behalf of his Party; I am prepared, as far as I am entitled to speak, to give a similar undertaking on the part of the Government's supporters, and I hope the right hon. Gentlemen on the front bench opposite will make a similar statement on behalf of the English Opposition.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I have not had time to communicate with my friends on this matter, but I feel strongly that it is in the interest of both sides of the House that no objection should be raised to the giving of all information possible in regard to the public service, and I think the objection taken on the other side is very much to be regretted. I hope this will be regarded as closed, and that in future no obstacle will be placed in the way of getting every possible information.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): I was interested in the matter the other night which has given rise to this discussion. The objection taken was due to the fact that the notice of Motion for the Return had only appeared on the Paper that day. There had been no time to consider it, and that was why the objection was taken. I have no desire to block any information. My only desire was to get more complete information than was asked for in that particular Return.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): I presume that nothing in any understanding come to will invalidate your ruling as to the right of an hon. Member to object to unopposed Returns if he wishes to do so.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I do not think it is necessary for me to add anything to what I have already said.

Return ordered, "setting forth the names and addresses of all persons who have been committed to unlimited terms of imprisonment for Contempt of Court in Ireland to the 31st day of December, 1904; the names of the Judges who issued the orders of attachment; the charges against the persons attached; and the duration of imprisonment in each case in which the order for attachment was executed (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 145, of session 1902)."—(*Mr. P. A. McHugh.*)

COMMISSION OF THE PEACE (IRELAND.)

Returns ordered, "for each county, city, and borough in Ireland of the names of the persons holding the Commission of the Peace, and giving the date of appointment of each such Justice, and, so far as can be ascertained, the designation, profession, or occupation of each such person at the time of his appointment to the Commission of the Peace, stating at the foot of the Return for each county, city, and borough, so far as can be ascertained, and with such accuracy as is possible, in the absence of any official record, the aggregate number of such persons that are Protestants, specifying their denominations, the number that are Roman Catholics, and the number that are members of any other religious denomination, and the number of such persons that are of each such designation, profession, or occupation, so far as the same can be ascertained."

"For the whole of Ireland, of the number of such persons of each religious denomination that are of each such designation, profession, or occupation, so far as the same can be ascertained."

"And of the number of such persons usually resident in such county, city, or borough (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 336, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. P. A. McHugh.*)

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES (DUBLIN).

Return ordered, "of the Joint Stock Companies and Limited Liability Companies registered in accordance with the Acts thereunto provided in the municipal district of the City of Dublin, showing their capital as registered, whether ordinary, preference, or debenture."—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES, ETC. (DUBLIN) (RATEABLE VALUE).

Return ordered, "of the Rateable Valuation as it now stands on the books of the Chief Commissioners for Valuation in Ireland, of the tenements, holdings, and hereditaments in respect of which Limited Liability Companies and Joint Stock Companies carrying on business in the municipal district of the city of Dublin are rated for, and upon which rates and taxes are actually levied."—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

THE CLOSURE OF SUPPLY.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In moving that we do now adjourn I may perhaps say to the House, in pursuance of the pledge I gave them earlier in the afternoon, that the Motion I propose to move to-morrow consists essentially in providing that every Vote necessary by law to finish the financial business of the year shall be closured at the latest date which makes it possible to fulfil the law. It provides, also, that no Government business other than Supply shall be taken until the close of the financial year; it leaves the rights of private Members at the evening sittings and on Fridays undisturbed, and it will not, I hope, lead to any late sittings of the House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The statement which has just been made by the right hon. Gentleman indicates very clearly the important and complicated nature of the Motion of which he has given notice. I desire to renew the appeal I made to him at Question time that he should postpone the consideration of this Motion until such time as it has appeared on the Notice Paper sufficiently long to enable Members thoroughly to master it and to put down such Amendments as they desire to move. I think it would be for the convenience of the House if the right hon. Gentleman would read to us the terms of the Motion. I rather gather from what he has said that if he did read the terms the House would see that the Motion from its character was one which it would be improper to ask the House to enter on the discussion of to-morrow when it had not been on the Notice Paper a single day. It is against the Rules of the House to ask a Question unless that Question has been in print on the Notice Paper twenty-four hours, and yet we are asked to embark on the discussion of this long, unprecedented, and complicated Motion without seeing it until the morning of the day on which the discussion is to be inaugurated. In the interest of the proper conduct of public business I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to give a little more notice of this absolutely unprecedented Motion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Motion is a long one [cries of "Read"], but it is not complicated. [Cries of "Why not read?"] I do not think anything would be gained by reading it. It is only long because it deals with each separate piece of business that we have to finish in order to comply with the law.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I would like to point out that the right hon. Gentleman has given no instance in which such a proposal has ever been moved without notice. This Motion relates to the guillotine closure of the discussion on the Estimates. The right hon. Gentleman has the ordinary closure in his hand, and therefore he could have gone on with the Estimates in the ordinary way and have accelerated the progress with the ordinary closure. This would have given the House an opportunity to amend this extremely revolutionary proposal. The right hon. Gentleman must remember that he is not justified by anything that has occurred in proposing this revolutionary

Motion. It is entirely due to the late period at which the House has been called together.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I should have thought that this was not the proper time to debate whether the Motion was necessary. I think I can prove to the House conclusively to-morrow that the ordinary closure of which the right hon. Gentleman spoke is totally inadequate to meet the legal necessities of the case, and until I have attempted to make my case, I hope that the House will not try to prejudge it.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer my appeal about further notice ?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Time is going on. What pledge can I get in return with regard to the management of business.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: All I can say to the right hon. Gentleman is that this attempt to drive the House without any notice will not result in the saving of time.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no desire to drive the House more than is absolutely necessary. [Cries of "You are driving it," and "It is intolerable."] The hon. Gentleman can give no pledge as to the course——

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: The Prime Minister has made a rather pointed appeal to me, and I submit that I am entitled to answer that appeal. [Interruptions from the Ministerial side.] The unmannerly interruptions ought not to be made. If the right hon. Gentleman will follow the precedent of previous years, and if necessary suspend the twelve o'clock rule on one or two nights, as he has done for the last ten or twelve years, I have no doubt that the House of Commons will get through the necessary business. But what I protest against is an entire innovation and the creation of a totally new precedent.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Motion which he will move is in the following terms—

"That, in order to comply with the Law the proceedings necessary to dispose of any Supplementary Estimates and Vote A and Vote 1 of the Estimates for the Navy, and of the Ways and Means Resolutions consequential thereon, shall, if not previously disposed of, be brought to a conclusion in the manner hereinafter mentioned."

"At half-past Five of the clock on the 21st day of March next, the Chairman shall forthwith put every Question necessary to dispose of the Vote then under consideration, and shall then forthwith put the Question that the total amount of the outstanding Votes for the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates be granted for the services defined in those Estimates, and shall also forthwith put every other Question necessary to dispose of those Votes."

"As soon as the Resolutions so disposed of are reported to the House, the House shall forthwith resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means, and the Chairman shall forthwith put every Question necessary to dispose of any Resolutions proposed in that Committee."

"At Ten of the clock on the 23rd day of March next, the Speaker shall forthwith put every Question necessary to dispose of the Report of the Resolution then under consideration, and shall then forthwith put the Question that the House doth agree with the Committee in all Resolutions reported in respect of the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates, and shall then put a like Question on the Resolution reported with respect to the Supplementary Estimates for the Army, and on the Resolutions reported with respect to Vote A and Vote 1 of the Estimates for the Navy."

"On the consideration of the Report from the Committee of Ways and Means, the Speaker shall forthwith put the Question that the House do agree with the Committee in the Resolutions reported."

And that at half-past Eleven of the clock on the 27th day of March next, the Speaker shall forthwith put any Question necessary to dispose of the Second Reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill; and at Seven of the clock on the 30th day of March next the Speaker shall forthwith put every Question necessary to dispose of the Third Reading of that Bill."

"And that the proceedings on going into Supply on the Army Estimates, and in Committee, and on Report, of Vote A and Vote 1 of those Estimates shall, if not previously disposed of, be brought to a conclusion in the following manner."

"At half-past Six of the clock on the 28th day of March next, the Speaker shall forthwith put every Question necessary to dispose of the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair on going into Supply on the Army Estimates."

"At halfpast Six of the clock on the 29th day of March next, the Chairman shall forthwith put every Question necessary to dispose of Vote A and Vote 1 of the Army Estimates in Committee."

At Eleven of the clock on the 30th day of March next, the Speaker shall forthwith put every Question necessary to dispose of the Report of the Resolutions with respect to Vote A and Vote 1 of the Army Estimates."

"Until the Business to which this Order relates is concluded the consideration of the Business of Supply at any sitting at which Government Business has precedence shall not be anticipated by a Motion for Adjournment, and no dilatory Motion shall be received on proceedings on that Business, and the Business shall not be interrupted under any Standing Order."

"Until the business to which this Order relates is concluded no Business other than Business of Supply shall be taken at any Sitting at which Government Business has precedence."

I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether he thinks that is a proper Resolution to give the House only a few hours notice of?

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I think the right hon. Gentleman should give a reply to that Question. If the right hon. Gentleman has no right to reply surely the Patronage Secretary of the Treasury who is sitting beside him can answer. Thanks to the enterprise of my hon. friend, we are now in possession of the terms of the Motion. This is an absolutely unprecedented Motion, and the right hon. Gentleman will find his task cut out to prove the contrary when he comes to move it. I suppose, Mr. Speaker you cannot even have seen such a Motion as this before. Times have been when Speakers would have intimated pretty strongly [Cries of "Order"] to the Leader of the House of Commons [Renewed cries of "Order"]——

*Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member not to make any reflections upon the Chair. The Resolution is not one which has been drafted by me in any shape; and the hon. Gentleman is now making suggestions which he has no right to make.

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS: If, Sir, anything I said conveyed, in the slightest degree, any reflection against the Speaker I withdraw it absolutely. Nothing was further from my thoughts than to make any suggestion as to the conduct of the present occupant of the Chair in this matter. I was only referring to what may perhaps be called ancient history, rather too ancient history, in my opinion, as to such matters as these. Of course you did not see the Resolution, and are in no way responsible for it. I am entitled to say that this is a most unprecedented Resolution which has been brought forward. I presume that we shall be allowed ample time free from any application of closure to discuss it. I protest against such a Motion in the strongest possible way in the name of the rights of the House of Commons, and of the rights of the minority, in which position, at some time, perhaps, before long, it will be the lot of hon. Members opposite to be.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman again, as I did at Question time, to consider whether the whole thing cannot be postponed till Thursday. It is a most complicated Resolution, and how can it be possible for us to hand in our Amendments when the matter is to be dealt with to-morrow? We are obliged to hand in every Amendment, and I know nothing more inconvenient to the House, and to you, Sir, than the adoption of the course now proposed to be taken. I would submit that nothing would be lost by discussing the Resolution on Thursday. The right hon. Gentleman could take the Supplementary Estimates to-morrow. It is most unfair that a complicated Resolution like this should be taken for discussion a few hours after notice has been given of it.

Major SEELY (Isle of Wight): I think that probably the right hon. Gentleman, in giving notice of the Motion, has forgotten the very special circumstances under which the most important Estimates are to be presented this year. I cannot speak with long knowledge of the House, but I believe it is unprecedented to bring the discussion on the Army Estimates to a close in this summary fashion. The Army Estimates this year are in a position that they have never been in before. Last year certain Estimates were presented to the House for an unprecedently large sum of money. The Secretary of State for War stated that they were only presented to the House on the understanding that certain great alterations were to be made by him and by the Cabinet in connection with an entirely new scheme. As far as we can understand, that new scheme is not now to be proceeded with. It cannot be denied that this House was quite unwillingly deceived, on the part of the right hon. Gentleman, into passing the Army Estimates last year without the least discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I interrupt the right hon. Gentleman to say that there will be a subsequent occasion when it will be possible to give the Army proposals adequate discussion.

MAJOR SEELY: I am sure we are all grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for the promise he has given. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to see that we are not put in the position of voting money and parting with our control for the second time in successive years. This is, of course, essentially no Party matter. We have been induced to pass Army Estimates on a certain basis, and the promises given have not been fulfilled for reasons which may be good or bad. Now, in the following year, the same difficulty arises, and for the first time in the history of Parliament we are asked to curtail the discussion of these Estimates in an exceptional degree. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that as soon as the new year begins he will give us the opportunity of discussing the Army. I should very much doubt whether he will be able to give that opportunity, and I would press him to reconsider the Resolution, if only with regard to the Army Estimates. With the best will in the world he will admit that it may be impossible, after the money has been voted, to discuss this matter, which is of transcendent importance to the Empire.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he had never known any Government gain anything by "snap" Resolutions. When the right hon. Gentleman proposed this Resolution the House would discuss the whole matter in order to get time to put Amendments on the Paper. He believed, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman would gain more by coming to some arrangement by which they would have an opportunity of putting their Amendments on the Paper before the discussion came on.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) said the Prime Minister was alone responsible for the conduct of the business of the House. The present difficulty would have been avoided if the right hon. Gentleman had called the House together a fortnight earlier. The special responsibility rested upon the shoulders of the Prime Minister of maintaining the tradition, rights, and privileges of this House, and he ought not to closure debate in the way he had been doing recently.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) expressed the hope that no further appeals would be made to the Prime Minister from his side of the House. This was a matter which must be fought out. Everybody knew that these appeals were not going to have the least effect. He had seen in the last few minutes an incident which was unprecedented, and, to his mind, shocking. When he came into the House the feeling of respect towards the House was so great that every Member was compelled to read the words of a Resolution. He had lived to see the day when the Leader of the House declined to give to the public the information which had already been given to the clerks. He understood that the Prime Minister gave a distinct pledge that the terms of the Resolution should be given to the House that day. The manner in which the right hon. Gentleman fulfilled that pledge was to say that the Resolution would be presented with the Parliamentary Papers in the morning. Was it not intolerable that at ten minutes to one o'clock—— [Laughter and interruption on the MINISTERIAL side.] He knew that the right hon. Gentleman could offer no insult to the House of Commons which would not be condoned and approved by Gentlemen on the other side. He put it to every Member of the House who still had some respect for the functions of this Assembly whether it was tolerable that the Leader of the House should decline to put the House in possession of the Resolution the terms of which were in the hands of the clerks at the Table. So far as he could trace, it was part of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman to flout and insult this Assembly on every possible occasion. Under the *régime* of the right hon. Gentleman, in every session of Parliament for years, millions of money had been voted without one word of discussion on the part of those who were mainly sent there to watch the interests of the ratepayers. That was a system which in time would make this nation a by-word for its extravagance among the nations of the world. He had one suggestion to make. The right hon. Gentleman should relieve the House and the country of a Premiership of which the country, at least, had shown itself weary; and he should transfer to Russia and the Tsar his eminent services in gagging discussion.

On the Question, "That the House do now adjourn," being put, there were cries of "Yes" and "No."

*MR. SPEAKER: It is my duty to declare that the Ayes have it, and to say that the House now stands adjourned.

Adjourned at six minutes before One o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

STATEMENT EXPLANATORY OF NAVY ESTIMATES,

1905–6.

The Estimates for 1905–6 amount to 33,389,000*l*. as opposed to 36,889,000*l* for the current year. This reduction is mainly accounted for by reductions on Votes 8 and 9 which are due to a decreased liability for new construction and to a decreased liability for repairs.

The decreased liability for new construction is due to the fact that the liability on the ships at the present moment under construction is not so great as was the liability on those under construction a year ago, and to the fact that the payment for the *Triumph* and *Swiftsure*, bought from the Chilian Government, does not recur. The decrease in the liability for repairs is due to the policy, explained in my memorandum of December 6th last, of eliminating from the Navy, as far as possible, all ships which would be of comparatively small fighting value in time of war, and to the fact that the arrears in the repairs of the Fleet have been overcome. It is due to the late Controller, Rear-Admiral Sir William May, K.C.V.O., to say that I do not believe the Fleet has ever been in a more perfect state of repair than it is at the present moment.

The logical consequences of the policy explained in my memorandum of December 6th last have also affected other parts of Vote 8, Vote 2, and other votes in an economical direction.

ADMINISTRATION.

No important changes have taken place in the organisation of the Admiralty during the past year, and the changes reported in previous years are all working well. By a new Order in Council dated 10th August 1904, the final step was taken in the readjustment of the distribution of business to the Members of the Board by eliminating from the work of the Senior Naval Lord every thing that is not concerned with important naval policy and the preparation of the Fleet for war. The opportunity was taken at the same time to restore the old title of Sea Lord, and the titles of the naval Members of the Board henceforth will be First Sea Lord, Second Sea Lord, Third Sea Lord and Controller, Fourth Sea Lord.

I have to announce that the Board have appointed a special Committee to inquire into the present system of dockyard organisation and administration as it affects the personnel and the execution of shipbuilding and repairs. It is hoped that an increase of efficiency and of economy will result from the labours of the Committee, and it is especially desired that references and correspondence may be minimised and that a fuller decentralisation of the dockyards from the Admiralty and an ampler devolution of responsibility upon the Admirals Superintendent may be achieved.

APPENDIX I.

PERSONNEL.

The Navy suffered a great loss in the death of Rear-Admiral H. J. May, who had inaugurated the war course at Greenwich with such singular success. His place has been taken by Captain E. J. W. Slade, M.V.O., R.N., and the work is proceeding satisfactorily. The Board, however, are of opinion that a great development could be given to the course if it could be transferred from Greenwich to Portsmouth, and provision is proposed under Vote 10 for building quarters on Whale Island for the Sub-lieutenants now resident in the Naval College in Portsmouth Dockyard. Much loss of time will thereby be avoided to the Sub-lieutenants undergoing their courses of gunnery, and the quarters at present occupied by them will become available for the officers attending the enlarged war course.

In my memorandum of last year I mentioned that a scheme had been adopted in connection with the Medical Branch and the Chaplains of the Navy to enable young Surgeons and young Clergymen, who might not desire to make the Navy their permanent sphere of work, to join it for four or five years, at the end of which time they might either join the service permanently at the discretion of the Admiralty or leave it with a substantial gratuity. It is still too soon to say whether this scheme is going to attract additional candidates for appointment, but I wish again to draw attention to it.

In September next the first batch of cadets who joined the Royal Navy College at Osborne will have completed two years there, and they will be transferred to the Royal Naval College at Dartmouth. Mr. Cyril E. Ashford, the first Headmaster of Osborne, who has inaugurated the teaching of the College so successfully, will be transferred to Dartmouth, and henceforth every cadet entering the Navy will pass his first two years at Osborne and his second two years at Dartmouth. The course of training will, of course, be consecutive. A few cadets have had to be withdrawn from the College, but none I am happy to say on account of unsatisfactory conduct. Those who have been withdrawn have been so withdrawn on the authority of the Board, after consultation with the Captain and Headmaster of the College, either on the ground that they were not likely to pass satisfactorily the examination out of the College at the end of their period of training or on the ground that they were not thoroughly suited to the conditions of naval life. The plan of inviting all boys who apply for nominations to appear before the Committee of Inspection has continued to work with complete success and all applicants have been treated on the same basis and with scrupulous fairness.

The gunnery of the Fleet continues steadily to improve and the Admiralty have decided with the concurrence of the Treasury to appoint a new officer called the Inspector of Target Practice. His duties will in no place clash with those of the Director of Naval Ordnance. He will not be an Admiralty Officer but working under the Superintendence of the First Sea Lord he will visit the Fleets and Squadrons and supply the Commanders-in-Chief with the most recent information which the Admiralty have at their disposal.

The total number of officers seamen boys, and Royal Marines, voted for the year 1904–7 was 131,100. The numbers asked for for 1905–6 are 129,000, showing a reduction of 2,100. This reduction is consequential on the policy, explained in my memorandum of the 6th December, of eliminating from the Navy as many ships as possible that would be comparatively ineffective fighting factors in time of war. Vote 1 remains practically of the same amount as for the current year, because when an increase of numbers takes place which is spread over all the weeks in the year, it is only necessary to take money for the pay of that increase for half a year, and, consequently, the sum based on an increase last year of 4,100 exactly meets the necessities of the case when there is a reduction of 2,100, after that increase has been attained. If there had not been this reduction of men and boys there would have been a considerable increase on the vote for pay.

APPENDIX I.

The experiment of enlisting a certain number of non-continuous service seamen and stokers has been successful, and it is proposed to increase the proportion of men so enlisted with a view to increasing numbers of the Royal Fleet Reserve. It is also proposed to give greater facilities to continuous service men of good character, who for some reason may desire to retire into civil life before the expiration of their period of engagement, to do so on condition that they join the Royal Fleet Reserve. The progress of the Royal Fleet Reserve continues satisfactory and by the end of the present financial year Class B is expected to number more than 6,000 men.

Recruiting for the Royal Navy Reserve has also been satisfactory, but it is not necessary to increase the numbers beyond what they at present stand at, 29,500 men, owing to the steady increase of the Royal Fleet Reserve. The branch of the Royal Naval Reserve in Newfoundland continues to make good progress, and the branches in Australia and New Zealand have been well started during the year. The enlistment of Australians and New Zealanders for non-continuous service in the Royal Navy began during the year, and an excellent class of men have presented themselves. A small branch of the Royal Naval Reserve has also been established at Malta.

The Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve continues to do well and strong divisions have been formed on the Thames, the Clyde, the Sussex coast, the Severn, and the Mersey, while a division is in progress of formation on the Tyne.

It will be recollected that the Committee on Naval Reserves, presided over by Sir Edward Grey, Bart., M.P., recommended that the Board should aim at a total reserve force of 50 per cent. of the numbers required to mobilise the fleet, harbour establishments, signal stations, &c., for war. I am glad to be able to report that this standard has now been reached, and that after such mobilisation for war the numbers of active service ratings, Royal Fleet Reserve, Royal Naval Reserve, and Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, which would remain available, amount to the required total.

Altogether, whether for the active service ratings of the Navy, boys youths and men, for the Royal Marines, or for the Royal Naval Reserves, nothing could be more satisfactory than the numbers and quality of those wishing to join His Majesty's Naval forces. Indeed, the number of eligible canditates is far in excess of the requirements.

Construction, Re-construction, and Repairs.

I have already explained the reasons for the diminution as compared with the current year of the sum (9,566,000*l*) asked for new construction for the year 1905–6. During the current year the work on the ships under construction both in the Royal and private dockyards has made steady and satisfactory progress. A delay of a few months beyond the time originally specified will take place in the completion of the armoured cruisers of the *Devonshire* class, but this delay was deliberately incurred by the Board for the sake of improving the armament in these ships by the substitution of a certain number of 7.5–inch for 6–inch guns. Of the current year's programme the two battleships of the *Lord Nelson* class have been given out to contract and three armoured cruisers have been begun in the Royal Dockyards. In view of the changed conditions which have developed since the presentation of the estimates of last year the Board are prepared to take upon themselves the responsibility of recommending to Parliament that the fourth armoured cruiser and some of the destroyers of the year's programme should be postponed. Ten submarines have been ordered; one destroyer of the *River* class was bought ready made from the makers and five ocean-going destroyers of a new type are on the eve of being ordered under circumstances which I will proceed to explain.

APPENDIX I.

In the development of the destroyer class two qualities have successively predominated, speed and sea-keeping power. Their study of the tactical and other questions involved has led the Board to the conclusion that two classes of destroyer are required for the Navy, one for ocean work and the other for the narrow seas. They have accordingly decided to combine the qualities of speed and sea-keeping power in a special type of ocean-going destroyer, which will be expensive and of which therefore, the numbers must be comparatively few and to design a new type of coastal destroyer which will be comparatively cheap and of which, therefore, the numbers can be larger.

Between the 1st April 1904 and the 31st March 1905 inclusive, the following ships will have been completed, and become available for service :—

4 Battleships—

King Edward VII. *Swiftsure.*
Commonwealth. *Triumph.*

1 Armoured Cruiser—

Cornwall.

4 Third Class Cruisers—

Diamond. *Topaze.*
Sapphire. *Amethyst.*

12 Submarines.
9 Destroyers.
4 Torpedo Boats.
1 River Gunboat, and
A new Admiralty Yacht.

On the 1st April 1905, there will be under construction :—

8 Battleships.
15 Armoured Cruisers.
1 Second Class Cruiser.
1 Third Class Cruiser.
8 Scouts.
18 Destroyers.
11 Submarines.

The work of re-construction and re-armament which was begun two years ago in respect of the battleships of the *Barfleur* and *Royal Sovereign* classes, and in respect of the *Powerful*, *Arrogant*, and *Talbot* classes of cruisers will have been completed by the end of the present financial year, except in the case of the *Eclipse*, for which provision is made in these estimates.

In my memorandum of the 6th December last I stated that the Board had decided to appoint a special committee on designs to assist them and the Director of Naval Construction in the consideration of certain questions to be submitted to it by the Board in connection with the features of the future designs of different types of fighting ships. I have now to report the Committee has been constituted as follows, and is at work :—

Admiral Sir John Fisher, G.C.B. (President).
Rear-Admiral H.S.H. Prince Louis of Battenberg, G.C.B., G.C.V.O., A.D.C.
Engineer Rear-Admiral Sir John Durston, K.C.B., Engineer-in-Chief of the Fleet.
Rear-Admiral Alfred L. Winsloe, C.V.O., C.M.G.
Captain Henry B. Jackson, F.R.S., R.N.
Captain John R. Jellicoe, C B., R.N.
Captain Reginald H. S. Bacon, D.S.O., R.N.
Captain Charles E. Madden, M.V.O., R.N.

APPENDIX I.

Mr. Philip Watts, LL.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., Director of Naval Construction.

The Right Hon. The Lord Kelvin, O.M., G.C.V.O.

Professor J. H. Biles, Glasgow University.

Sir John Thornycroft, F.R.S., D.C.L.

Mr. Alexander Gracie (Fairfield Shipbuilding Co.).

Mr. R. E. Froude, F.R.S., Superintendent of Admiralty Experiment Works, Haslar.

Mr. W. H. Gard, M.V.O., Chief Constructor.

Commander Wilfred Henderson, R.N. (Secretary).

Mr. E. H. Mitchell, Assistant Constructor (Assistant Secretary).

The instructions to the Committee were drawn up by the Board after previous conference and consultation with the Commanders-in-Chief of the Channel and Atlantic Fleets, Admirals Sir Arthur Wilson, V.C., K.C.B., and Lord Charles Beresford, K.C.B.

I may claim that the work of this Committee will enable the Board to ensure to the Navy the immediate benefit of the experience which is to be derived from the naval warfare between Russia and Japan and of the resultant studies of the Naval Intelligence Department. I can, however, hold out no hope that it will be consistent with the interests of the public service to publish either the reference to the Committee or its report.

It is proposed to begin during the financial year 1905–6 :—

1 Battleship.
4 Armoured Cruisers.
5 Ocean-going Destroyers.
1 Ocean going Destroyer of an experimental type.
12 Coastal Destroyers.
11 Submarines.

His Majesty has approved that the Battleship should be called the *Dreadnought* and the first of the Armoured Cruisers the *Invincible.*

The sum devoted to the commencement of new ships in 1905–6 is a little over one and a quarter million pounds, and the Board have great hopes of successfully inaugurating a policy of shipbuilding by which, while fewer ships will be under construction at the same moment than has lately been the case, the period of the completion of a ship will be materially shortened from the present average of 30 to 36 months.

It is also proposed to ask Parliament to provide money for the commencement of a second Royal Yacht. Her late Majesty had three yachts of different sizes, for all of which she had constant use. One of these yachts has been replaced by the *Victoria and Albert* which, after encountering unfortunate vicissitudes on her first completion, is now established as a great success in yacht building. It is not proposed to replace the *Alberta*, but it is necessary, that there should be a smaller yacht in addition to the big one, and, as the hull of the *Osborne* is worn out after 30 years of service and she can no longer be certified as safe for His Majesty's general use if he should require to visit any port of his dominions or any continental port into which the *Victoria and Albert* cannot enter, it is time that a new one should be commenced. A sum of 50,000*l*. for the year's work has been inserted in these estimates, subject to the approval of the House of Commons. The yacht will be put out to tender among a selected list of private firms.

The policy of sending ships to the private yards has fulfilled its object, and the arrears in the repairs of the Fleet have been mastered and are a thing of the past. It is not, therefore, necessary to provide next year for the repairs of any ships at the private yards, and henceforth it should be borne in mind that the first business of the

Royal Dockyards is to keep the Fleet in repair, and accordingly the amount of new construction allotted to those dockyards should be subordinated to this main consideration. We have now in the United Kingdom a splendid national asset in the numerous private yards, and experience has shown that, whereas new construction can certainly be as cheaply executed in them as in the Royal Dockyards, all repairs are more economically effected in the Royal than in the private dockyards.

Considerable anxiety has been felt from time to time as to the possible exhaustion of the South Wales coal beds producing the coal most suitable for use in ships of war, and many suggestions have been made to the Board of Admiralty that they ought to purchase collieries and coalfields to be held as a reserve. The Report of the Royal Commission on Coal Supplies shows, however, that the resources of such coal still remaining unworked are so vast that the requirements of the Navy may be considered as provided for for so many years to come that all anxiety upon the subject is removed.

The experiments in connection with the use of oil fuel still continue, but it is now quite certain that oil has taken its place as part of the fuel of the Navy, and every arrangement is being made for its supply, storage, and distribution.

Distribution of the Fleet.

As a logical consequence of the policy explained in my memorandum of the 6th December last, it has became possible to effect considerable economies in some of the dockyards outside the United Kingdom. Accordingly, those at Halifax, Esquimalt, Jamaica, and Trincomalee will be reduced to cadres, on which the expenditure in time of peace will be small, but which can in time of war be at once developed according to necessity. The expenditure at Ascension will also be reduced.

In that memorandum I made no allusion to the distribution of torpedo craft, and I have now to report that in completion of their programme of re-distribution it has been decided by the Board to appoint a Rear-Admiral in place of a Captain to be in general charge of all torpedo craft in home waters under the Admiral commanding the Channel Fleet. At Devonport and at Portsmouth eight, and at Chatham four, torpedo boats have been put into permanent commission, while flotillas of submarine boats are also in course of organisation.

Since the commencement of the year over one hundred vessels of various classes have been successfully commissioned in reserve, and the battleships and cruisers in commission in reserve at Devonport have made their first cruise and had their first gunnery and torpedo practice at sea under the Flag Officer in command of that reserve squadron.

I append the usual statement of the work done in the past year by the various departments of the Admiralty.

February 14, 1905. SELBORNE.

APPENDIX I.

STATEMENT OF WORK, 1904–5, &c.

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE FLEETS.

Mediterranean.

The Battleship Squadron now consists of eight ships of the same (*Formidable*) Class the *Queen* and *Prince of Wales* having joined the Squadron, and the six *Duncan* Class having been transferred to the Channel Fleet.

The Cruiser Division has been strengthened by the addition of the Armoured Cruisers *Suffolk* and *Lancaster*, while the Armoured Cruiser *Bacchante* has been replaced by the Armoured Cruiser *Leviathan*, a vessel of a larger and faster type. With the *Aboukir* these three ships compose the Third Cruiser Squadron.

The Second Class Cruisers *Naiad* and *Intrepid* have been replaced by the *Minerva* and *Venus*, vessels of the same class. The *Diana* was relieved by the *Astræa*, and after refit relieved the Second Class Cruiser *Arrogant*. The *Furious*, a vessel of the same type as the *Arrogant*, has been replaced by the *Juno*. The *Astræa* was transferred to China on the arrival of the *Lancaster*, and the *Hermione* was withdrawn from the Station on the arrival of the *Suffolk*. The effect of this is to leave a homogeneous squadron of four Second Class Cruisers of the *Talbot* Class.

The Third Class Cruisers *Mohawk*, *Pioneer*, *Pyramus*, *Pandora*, and *Pegasus*, and the Torpedo Gunboats *Harrier*, *Hussar*, *Dryad* and *Speedy* have been withdrawn from the Station and will be replaced by four of the new *Scouts* when they are ready.

The number of destroyers on the Station has been brought up to 40 by the addition of eight vessels of the new *River* Class (*Erne, Ettrick, Exe, Itchen, Foyle, Dee, Cherwell* and *Arun*), and four 30-knot vessels (*Angler, Lively, Sprightly* and *Quail*).

The *Hercules*, Third Class Battleship, has been sent to Gibraltar as a hulk accommodate Dockyard workmen.

North America and West Indies.

In consequence of the formation of the Particular Service (Fourth Cruiser) Squadron, mainly composed of cadets' and boys' training ships, great changes have been made in the North America Station. The First Class Cruiser *Ariadne* has become the Flagship of the new Squadron.

The Second Class Cruiser *Indefatigable* has been withdrawn.

The Third Class Cruisers *Pelorus* and *Prometheus*, which relieved the *Retribution* and *Tribune*, will be transferred to the Cape and Australian Stations respectively; and the Second Class Cruiser *Charybdis* will shortly return to England.

The Third Class Cruiser *Pallas*, and the Sloops *Fantome* and *Alert* have been paid off and laid up at Bermuda, and the Yacht *Columbine* has been paid off and laid up at Halifax.

It is intended shortly to send out the new Third Class Cruiser *Diamond* to the Station; her Commanding Officer will carry out the duties of Senior Naval Officer in the West Indies in the absence of the Particular Service Squadron.

APPENDIX I.

The title of the Commander-in Chief will in future be " Commander-in-Chief of the North American and West Indies Station and of the Particular Service Squadron.

Important changes have taken place in regard to the ships employed for training purposes, all the old vessels having been replaced by modern and efficient ships.

The First Class Cruiser *Hawke* has replaced the Masted Cruiser *Northampton*, as training ship for youths. The *St. George*, a First Class Cruiser, has replaced the *Calliope* and *Cleopatra*, Masted Third Class Cruisers of very old type, and is now employed as training ship for boys. The First Class Cruiser *Gibraltar* has replaced the old Second Class Cruiser *Iris*, and the Third Class Cruisers *Medea* and *Medusa* training ships for boys. The Second Class Cruiser *Highflyer* has replaced the old First Class Armoured Cruiser *Aurora* as training ship for cadets.

These four ships, together with the *Ariadne*, the Second Class Cruiser *Isis*, and the *Diamond* will form the new Particular Service Squadron, under the command of the Commander-in-Chief of the North America and West Indies Station, and will cruise in West Indian Waters and Home Waters, being based on Devonport.

China.

No change has taken place in the Battleship Squadron, which consists of four ships of the *Canopus* Class with the *Centurion*.

The armoured Cruisers *Cressy* and *Leviathan* have been relieved by the *Hogue* and the *Sutlej*.

The First Class Cruiser *Blenheim* has been relieved by the *Andromeda*.

The Second Class Cruisers *Talbot* and *Eclipse* have been relieved by the *Iphigenia* and *Astræa*. The *Thetis* will be relieved by the *Bonaventure*, to be transferred to the China Station from the Pacific Station.

The Third Class Cruiser *Fearless* and the Sloops *Espiegle*, *Rinaldo*, and *Vestal* have been withdrawn without relief.

The Gunboats *Tweed*, *Bramble*, and *Britomart*, and the Sloops *Algerine*, *Phœnix*, and *Rosario* have been paid off and laid up at Hong Kong.

The Shallow Draft Steamer *Widgeon* has been sent out from England. There are now nine vessels of this type on the Station and employed on Chinese rivers.

The Destroyer *Sparrowhawk* struck a sunken rock near Shanghai on the 17th June and became a total loss. Of the eight Destroyers on the Station it is intended to keep six in commission and two with nucleus crews.

Australia.

The Squadron has been strengthened by the addition of the new Second Class Cruiser *Challenger*, and part of her Naval crew is being gradually replaced by the entry of Colonials.

The Second Class Cruiser *Encounter* will be added to the Squadron about the middle of the year.

The Third Class Cruisers *Tauranga*, *Ringarooma*, and *Boomerang* have been withdrawn from the Station.

The *Phœbe*, *Mildura*, and *Katoomba* are in commission as Drillships.

The Third Class Cruiser *Pylades* will shortly be relieved by the *Prometheus*—a vessel of a more modern type, and the Sloop *Mutine* by the *Pegasus* (Third Class Cruiser.)

APPENDIX I

East Indies.

The Third Class Cruiser *Pomone* has been relieved by the *Proserpine*, a vessel of the same type.

The Third Class Cruiser *Porpoise* has been paid off at Bombay, and the Sloop *Merlin* has been withdrawn.

Cape of Good Hope.

The Third Class Battleship *Simoon* (formerly called *Monarch*), which was employed as Guardship at Simonstown, has been withdrawn.

The First Class Cruiser *Gibraltar* has been relieved by the *Crescent*, a vessel of the same class.

The Third Class Cruiser *Pearl*, the Gunboat *Partridge*, and the Sloop *Odin* have been paid off and laid up at Simonstown.

The Third Class Cruiser *Barrosa* will shortly be replaced by the *Pelorus*, a larger and more modern vessel.

Channel Fleet.

The Home Fleet has been renamed the Channel Fleet, and has been greatly strengthened during the year. The Battleships *Resolution, Hood, Benbow*, and *Anson* have been replaced by four Battleships of the most modern type, the *Exmouth* and *Russell* (of the *Duncan* Class) and the *Triumph* and *Swiftsure*, which were originally built to the order of the Chilian Government. The four *Duncans* from the Mediterranean have also been transferred to the Channel Fleet, which will now consist of two fast divisions, consisting of six *Duncans* and two *Swiftsures*, and one slower division consisting of four *Royal Sovereigns*, to be subsequently replaced by four *Majestics* from the Atlantic Fleet.

In addition to the First Cruiser Squadron two smaller cruisers, the *Dido* (second class) and the *Topaze* (third class) are not attached to the Fleet, to which will be added two of the new *Scouts* when ready.

Atlantic Fleet.

This Fleet, which was formerly called the Channel Fleet, has been strengthened by the addition of two Battleships, and now includes eight Battleships of the *Majestic* Class. Four of these ships will shortly be relieved by the first four ships of the new *King Edward VII.* Class, and will then be transferred to the Channel Fleet to replace the four *Royal Sovereigns*, vessels of an older and slower type.

The Second Cruiser Squadron has been affiliated to the Atlantic Fleet, and in addition to two cruisers, the *Doris* (second class) and the *Amethyst* (third class), are attached for scouting and despatch work, to which will be added two of the new *Scouts* when ready.

The First and Second Cruiser Squadrons.

The First Cruiser Squadron, which was previously an independent command, and known as the Cruiser Squadron, is now affiliated to the Channel Fleet. It has been temporarily reduced by one ship, and now consists of five Armoured Cruisers, the *Good Hope* (Flagship) and four *Monmouths*.

A fifth Cruiser of the same class, the *Lancaster*, will be added as soon as one of the new *Devonshire* Class is ready to relieve her in the Mediterranean.

APPENDIX I.

The Second Cruiser Squadron is formed of the *Drake* (withdrawn from the First Cruiser Squadron), two Armoured Cruisers from the Channel Fleet, and the two First Class Cruisers from the Atlantic Fleet, the crews of which turned over to the Armoured Cruisers, *Cornwall* and *Cumberland*.

The Squadron thus constituted is made up of one *Drake* and four *Monmouths*, and will be increased in June by the addition of a sixth armoured cruiser, the *Suffolk*. From the 1st February the Squadron will be under the command of a Rear-Admiral, who will fly his flag in the *Drake*, and will be affiliated to the Atlantic Fleet.

Home Ports,

The First Class Cruisers, *Endymion* and *Theseus*, have relieved the old Armoured Cruisers, *Immortalite* and *Undaunted*, as Gunnery Training Ships, and the First Class Cruiser, *Grafton*, will shortly replace the old Armoured Cruiser, *Narcissus*, for similar duty.

The First Class Cruiser, *Royal Arthur*, will replace the old Second Class Cruiser *Mercury*, as Navigational School Ship.

The Stationary Training Ship, *Lion*, has been paid off.

The Fleet Reserve has been abolished, and all ships which would formerly have been placed in that Reserve are now kept in commission with nucleus crews.

A Rear-Admiral has been appointed at each Port in command of the commissioned ships in Reserve.

Coast Guard and Fishery Service Ships.

The Second Class Cruisers, *Brilliant* and *Scylla*, have replaced the *Appollo* and *Andromache* as sea-going Royal Naval Reserve Drill Ships, and the *Melampus* will shortly be relieved by the *Latona*. These vessels are to cruise in future with the Channel Fleet during one month in each quarter.

The Special Service Vessels, *Hearty* and *Jackal*, have been relieved by the *Barham* (Third Class Cruiser) and the *Harrier* (Gunboat) for fishery duties.

The Gunboat *Onyx* has been relieved by the Gunboat *Dryad*.

The Gunboat *Hussar* has replaced the *Antelope* as Drill Ship at Portishead.

Manœuvres.

In May the combined Mediterranean and Channel Fleets and the Cruiser Squadron carried out exercises in the Mediterranean, and in August the Home and Channel Fleets and the Cruiser Squadron, together with the sea-going Royal Naval Reserve Drill Ships and seven specially commissioned Battleships, took part in combined tactical exercises in Home Waters.

At the same time all available Torpedo Craft and Submarines and Special Service Vessels on the Home Station were engaged in manœuvres in the Irish Channel.

PERSONNEL.

Officers.

The new scheme of training of Officers and Men has been systematically carried during the year 1904.

The Royal Naval College at Osborne has been developed as the Cadets entered term by term, and the scheme has worked so far to the complete satisfaction of the Authorities. A report was made by two independent Inspectors at the end of the first year upon the course of teaching followed, and they expressed full approbation of it. A similar report was made in the autumn by two Engineering Authorities upon the course of engineering training laid down. and the same satisfactory report was received.

Steps have been taken to prepare for the opening of the new Cadets' College at Dartmouth, and the present Headmaster of Osborne College has been selected for the same appointment at Dartmouth.

A new scheme for the training of Officers in Signalling has been drawn up, and instructions have been issued on the subject.

The War Courses for Officers are being revised and extended. A course for Lieutenants has been established. A limited number of Marine and Military Officers are allowed to attend these Courses.

The regulations with regard to the Full Pay Leave of Officers serving on Foreign Stations have been revised.

The regulations for the training of Engineer Cadets under the old system have been revised, so as to permit of the entry in the Royal Naval College at Keyham of a certain number of Students over and above the number required during the few years remaining under that system.

The regulations for the entry of Assistant Clerks have been revised, and an arrangement has been made tentatively for sending successful candidates abroad to study foreign languages before being appointed for duty in the Fleet.

Men.

The training of Boys and Youths has undergone certain modifications during the year. In substitution for the *Iris*, *Medea*, and *Medusa*, which had been detailed for the sea-going training of boys on leaving the Stationary Training Ships, two large Cruisers of the Edgar Class have been now appropriated for the purpose, and these vessels will return about every four months for the purpose of taking fresh drafts of boys for training. In the case of the youths a system was introduced early in the year under which the recruits were first of all put through a short systematic course of instruction in the Depôt at Chatham before being sent to sea in the *Northampton*. As a consequence of later changes in the ships maintained in commission, the youths will in future be put through a preliminary training at one of the Training Establishments under the Inspecting Captain, and then sent to sea for four months in a Cruiser of the *Edgar* Class.

The entry of Boy Artificers by competition at the open examinations for Dockyard Apprentices not having been entirely satisfactory, an arrangement has been concluded with certain local educational authorities in the United Kingdom by which they will nominate a limited number of boys considered physically and educationally fit for the Service. It is hoped by this means to obtain recruits from among the sons of the skilled artisans in the engineering and manufacturing districts.

The scheme of Gymnastic Training introduced in 1904 has been developed and extended. Special care has been taken to carry it out systematically among the younger recruits.

The output of gunnery ratings from the Gunnery schools being insufficient to meet the demands of the Fleet, it was decided to organise a special course of training men as Seamen Gunners and Gunlayers in the larger ships afloat. The men so trained are now being put through a final course in the Gunnery Schools. It is hoped that by next year the Schools will be able to meet all the demands made upon them.

The entry of Non-Continuous Service Seamen and Stokers has quite come up to the expectations, and it is believed that such men will be a useful addition to the class of men hitherto recruited for the Fleet. In order, however, to give recruits some general knowledge of their duties before being drafted to ships, it has been lately decided to put the Seamen ratings through a short course of training at the Depots before being drafted to sea-going ships ; the Stokers are already undergoing a course.

Fresh facilities have been given for the transfer of men from one rating to another. The number of Stokers required being still in excess, Seamen and Marines have been invited to volunteer for transfer to Stoker, and a considerable number of men have complied.

Special arrangements have been made for the employment of men in Submarine Boats, so as to prevent the inconvenience of losing the experience of trained men by the ordinary drafting process while the number of boats is increasing.

Great attention has been given to the training of Signalmen in the Fleet, and special instructions have been issued on the subject.

The system of Signal Instruction for all men entering the Coast Guard is now in full operation in the Signal School at Portsmouth, and it is expected that it will add greatly to the value of the Coast Guard in this respect.

The Manual of Seamanship for the use of Boys and Men in H. M. Fleet has been re-written and brought up to date, and will shortly be issued.

The regulations governing discharge by purchase have been revised and one scale established for both the Royal Navy and the Royal Marines. Facilities have also been afforded to men to join the Royal Fleet Reserve.

Recruiting has been very successful this year, the total number required having been obtained by the end of December.

For the first time in recent years the full number of Engine Room Artificers has been obtained, in fact, more than the required number for the whole year had been entered in the first six months.

The Reserve of Accountant Officers has been established, and favourable reports have been received upon the Officers who were embarked for training in the Fleet during the summer months.

The Sick Berth Attendants Reserve is making steady progress though the numbers recruited have not been so great as was hoped. Endeavours are being made to obtain recruits from Scotland and Ireland. Forty-three men went through a week's training on board ship in the course of last summer.

ROYAL MARINES.

Free rations (bread and meat and groceries) have been granted to Marines serving on shore, so that they are now on the same footing as the seaman in this respect.

The additional allowances, chiefly dependent upon efficiency, to which reference was made in the last Statement, have given great satisfaction, and have produced marked improvements, particularly in rifle shooting.

The Gunnery allowances of Royal Marines have been assimilated to those of Petty Officers and Seamen, and have already been productive of good results. The opening of the non-substantive ratings of Turret Gunlayers and Turret Sight-setters to Marines may be expected to excite still further emulation amongst the best men of the Corps to train and qualify for these ratings.

Gunnery badges similar to those worn by Seamen are now issued to Royal Marines.

APPENDIX I.

Regulations have been issued for improving the military training of Marines when serving afloat. Greater attention is being given to the training of Marines at the divisions in Morse and Semaphore as well as in Military Signalling.

The new Royal Naval School of Music has made considerable progress, and has outgrown the available accommodation at Eastney Barracks, where it has been temporarily located. The earlier training is, therefore, now carried out at the various Headquarters of the Royal Marines. On disembarkation Bandsmen will return to these Divisions in the same manner as other ranks of the Corps, and the School at Eastney has been made the Depôt School to complete the men's training, and to form them into bands for embarkation.

The total strength was about 700 of all ranks at the end of December.

Twenty-one bands under the new scheme are now embarked in H.M. Ships.

NAVAL RESERVES.

As anticipated in last year's Statement much larger numbers of the Royal Naval Reserve men have come forward for embarkation for three month's training, and the accommodation in the Sea Drill Ships proving insufficient, a number of Seamen had to be sent to Ships of the Home Fleet, which, as a rule, only take men of the Qualified Seaman class.

This shows the growing popularity of the Royal Naval Reserve generally, attributable no doubt to improvements made in the conditions of Service and more convenient facilities for training being given, especially the Sea Drill Ships.

Recruits have come forward in such large numbers that the full strength voted for the various ratings was practically reached by the end of November 1904.

1,586 Executive Officers were borne on 1st December 1904, the numbers voted for 1904–5 being 1,600.

The following numbers of qualified condidates are on the list of applicants :-

For Sub-Lieutenant	153
For Midshipman	89
Total	242

The numbers now undergoing Naval Training in H.M. Ships are :—

—	Lieutenants.	Sub-Lieutenants.	Midshipmen.	Total.
12 months' training	34	41 (39 as Acting-Lieutenant).	14 (All as Acting-Sub-Lieutenant).	89
Gunnery and Torpedo Courses	13	29 (25 as Acting-Lieutenant.)	1 (As Acting-Sub-Lieutenant).	43

366 Officers on the Active List have already undergone this training, and are in receipt of Training fees.

Of Commissioned Engineer Officers there are now borne 352.

Of the Warrant Engineers voted for 1904–5, 25 have been entered. The numbers obtained by direct entry in this class are not so large as anticipated, but it is hoped to advance a certain number from amongst the Engine Room Artificers, who are recommended for promotion during their training in H.M. Ships.

APPENDIX I.

The following Commissioned Officers have completed, or are undergoing, Courses

Senior Engineers	27
Engineers	81
Assistant Engineers	29
Total	137

The numbers of Reserve men borne on 31st December 1904 as compared with those voted for 1904–5, and borne in former years are :—

Class.	Voted.	Borne.		
	1904–5.	31.12.04.	31.12.03.	31.12.02.
Leading Seamen	150	90	—	—
Qualified Seamen	11,650	11,967	5,173	4,298
First Class (Old System)			6,020	6,472
Seamen	11,000	10,123	6,374	5,572
Second Class (Old System)			3,900	4,273
Engine Room Artificers	600	604	31	—
Firemen	5,200	5,815	4,540	4,033
Special Fireman Class	1,000	939	10	—
Totals	29,600	29,538	26,048	24,648

2,362 Qualified Seamen and Seamen as compared with 1,522 last year have embarked in H.M. Ships for training as well as of the new ratings, 428 E.R.A's and 7 Special Firemen.

By November last the numbers of the Colonial Royal Naval Reserve were :—

Australia	148
Newfoundland	511
Malta	344

Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve.

On 1st December 1904 the strength of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve (exclusive of Instructional Staff) was 3,053.

The *Buzzard* has taken up her moorings in the Thames as Drill Ship for the London Division, and the *Melita* has been offered for a similar purpose for the Mersey Division

The rank of Commander has been instituted for Officers Commanding Divisions and Officers Commanding Companies have been advanced to the rank of Lieutenant.

Officers have been permitted to undergo short courses of Gunnery Training at Portsmouth, and approval has been obtained for their receiving pay and travelling allowances on such occasions.

A certain number of men have been allowed to undergo a course of Signal Instruction at Portsmouth, and have shown great aptitude in making themselves efficient.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

Northern Estates.

Farms.—The season of 1904 having proved more favourable for agriculture than that of 1903, it has not been necessary to continue the abatements in rents of the arable farms which were granted in 1903.

APPENDIX I.

All the farms are let.

The purchase of the Estate of Low Crossgill, comprising about 268 acres, for a sum of 6,000*l.*, was completed in February last. The Estate adjoins the Greenwich Hospital farm of Cashburn, of which it forms a very desirable addition as it affords shelter for the flocks in severe weather. It has been let to the tenant of that farm.

In August the purchase of the Estate of Priorsdale, adjoining the Greenwich Hospital farm of Shawside, was completed. The estate comprises an area of about 1,830 acres, including about 250 acres of well grown and marketable timber. The purchase price, inclusive of the timber, was 9,750*l.*

The acquisition of this estate is likely to prove of great advantage as it contains the reservoir on which the whole of the mines along the valley of the Nent are dependent for their water supply.

Greenwich Estate.

Considerable progress has been made in bringing the property into a proper state of repair and enforcing the dilapidation covenants in leases. The better class of Shop property is being modernised and improved as opportunities permit.

The sum of 11,410*l.* has been awarded to the Admiralty by the Arbitrator appointed to decide the amount to be paid as compensation by the London County Council for the loss of tolls at Greenwich pier caused by the construction of the Greenwich and Millwall Tunnel.

ORDNANCE.

No provision for re-arming ships is required in 1905–6, and the requirements of the Fleet in Commission can be largely met from stores surrendered by older types of ships. It has thus been possible to reduce this Vote while at the same time making full provision for ships building.

Guns and Mountings.

The manufacture and issue of guns have been satisfactory during 1904–5, all requirements for re-armaments and new construction having been met.

Additional 7.5-inch B.L. guns have been provided for vessels of the *Devonshire* Class, and the number of 6-inch guns reduced.

12-inch 45-calibre and 9.2-inch 50-calibre B.L. guns are being provided for the Battleships, and 9.2-inch and 7.5-inch 50-calibre guns for the First Class Cruisers in the 1904–5 programme. Provision has been made in the Estimates for 1905–6 to begin the manufacture of these guns.

Exhaustive experiments upon night sights have resulted in obtaining a good optical sight which will be adopted in the more important gun mountings.

A new type of armour-piercing projectile, from which greater penetration can be obtained, has been satisfactorily tested, and is being introduced for all guns of 6-inch and higher calibre.

An alteration in the proportion of reserves of all transferable gun mountings has relieved the congestion in the gun mounting stores.

Increased gun mounting accommodation is being arranged for at Gibraltar and Hong Kong.

The gun mounting store at Chatham has been completed and is now in use.

APPENDIX I.

Instructional Armaments.

The Drill Batteries at the Naval Barracks at Portsmouth and Chatham have been equipped and are now in full use, and the necessary alterations to the Devonport Battery will be, it is hoped, concluded during the present financial year.

A powerful armament of 6-inch B.L. VII. guns have been arranged for the two new Cunarders now in process of construction.

Ordnance Depôts.

Reductions have been affected in the crews of Naval Ordnance vessels, and further reductions will be made if practicable.

The accommodation for Naval Ordnance Stores at Bombay has been increased.

Additional storage accommodation for Naval Ordnance Stores and improved facilities for rapid issue of the stores to ships are being provided at Malta.

Similar additions and improvements are in hand at Gibraltar, and will be provided at Hong Kong.

Torpedoes.

The Fleet Torpedo Practice established at the end of last year has been very successful. It is more realistic and interesting than previous torpedo practice, and the percentage of hits to torpedoes run has been good.

Improvements in submerged discharges and torpedo rooms are being effected to enable more rapid loading to be carried out.

A new torpedo with increased range and speed has been designed and is now under trial on the torpedo range at Portland.

Search Lights.

Search Lights have been improved by the general introduction of automatic lamps. Experiments are also being carried out at sea with electrically controlled projectors.

Wireless Telegraphy.

All ships from First Class Battleships down to Third Class Cruisers are being fitted with wireless telegraph apparatus.

COALING OF THE FLEET.

The large floating Coal Depôt, equipped with electrical transporting machinery has been delivered at Portsmouth.

Further attention has been given during the year to the addition of other types of craft to facilitate coaling operations, and also to the provision of reserves of Patent Fuel at certain Coaling Stations abroad.

Further progress has been made with experiments for coaling H.M. Ships at sea; the trials will be continued.

APPENDIX 1.

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Battleships.

The expectations in the last Statement as regards the Battleships to be completed and passed into Fleet Reserve in 1903–4 were realised.

All these six vessels, viz. four of the *Duncan* Class, and two of the *Formidable* Class, have been completed and were put into commission either in 1903–4 or in the opening months of 1904–5.

Of the eight Battleships of the *King Edward VII.* Class, building at the opening of the present financial year, the *King Edward VII.* has already been commissioned. and the *Commonwealth*, *Dominion*, and *Hindustan* have satisfactorily passed through all their steam trials. Good progress has been made on the *New Zealand*, and this vessel will be completed about the middle of 1905–6. Of the three later vessels laid down at the close of 1903–4, the *Britannia* has been launched, and it is anticipated that all three will be completed according to programme in 1906–7.

Of the two Battleships to be given out to Contract in 1904–5 the *Agamemnon* is to be laid down by Messrs. Beardmore and Company, and is to be completed for commission in two years and nine months, and the *Lord Nelson* will be laid down by Messrs. Palmer and Company of Jarrow, and is to be completed in three years.

Armoured Cruisers.

The whole of the 10 vessels of *Monmouth* Class have now been put into commission.

The six vessels of the *Devonshire* Class, four of which were to have been completed in 1904–5, will be a little delayed, owing to the work involved in the substitution of 2–7.5-inch guns with hydraulic mountings for the four foremost broadside 6-inch guns, and three of the class will be fitted for the use of liquid fuel.

The first two vessels of the *Duke of Edinburgh* Class have been launched. In the remaining four vessels (*Warrior* Class), the 10–6-inch main deck guns will be omitted and replaced by 4–7.5-inch guns with hydraulic mountings.

Three vessels of a still larger class of armoured cruiser (*Minotaur* Class), have been laid down in the Dockyards. They will carry 4–9.2-inch guns in pairs in end barbettes and 10–7.5-inch guns in single broadside barbettes. One of these vessels is being constructed with straight water lines in view of the opinion held by many Naval Officers that such an under-water form has some advantage at sea.

Second Class Cruisers.

The *Challenger* has been commissioned, and the *Encounter* is expected to be complete early next year.

Third Class Cruisers.

The four vessels of this class have passed successfully through their steam trials and one has been commissioned. The three vessels with reciprocating engines obtained an average speed of 22¼ knots. The *Amethyst*, fitted with turbine engines, reached a speed of over 23½ knots.

Scout Class.

The eight vessels of the *Scout* Class, which were under construction at the beginning of the current year, have made good progress. The whole of the eight should be completed in 1905–6, and it is hoped that some of them will be brought into service very early in that year.

APPENDIX I.

Destroyers.

All the Destroyers of the *River* Type (18 in number), ordered previous to 1903–4 have been completed and delivered.

The 15 of the same type ordered in 1903–4 are making good progress and should all be delivered during 1905–6.

Of the 14 Destroyers included in the currents year's programme, one has been ordered from the Palmer Company. This vessel, is in an advanced state of construction having been built by the Firm as a speculation. This vessel will be in all respects similar to the Destroyers ordered of the Firm by the Admiralty in 1903–4.

Submarines.

The orders for the 10 Submarines provided for in this year's programme have been placed. These are of the new B type.

Other Vessels.

The Admiralty Yacht *Enchantress*, the two Coast Guard Cruisers, *Squirrel* and *Argus*, and the *Widgeon*, shallow draught steamer, have been completed.

MACHINERY AND BOILERS.

The *Halcyon*, Torpedo Gunboat, which has been re-engined and re-boilered with water-tube boilers of the *Express* type, associated with light quick-running engines has completed her trials.

In the Final Report of the Boiler Committee, which has now been received, the policy recommended by the Committee at first of fitting a combination of Cylindrical and Water-tube Boilers with a reduced steam pressure has been abandoned. Accordingly, in the Battleships and Cruisers of *Lord Nelson* and *Minotaur* Classes, Water-tube Boilers only are being fitted, complete installations of Babcock and Wilcox or of Yarrow large tube type being selected for each of these ships.

The Automatic Forced lubrication arrangements which proved successful in the Torpedo Boat Destroyer *Syren* are being fitted in the Torpedo Boat Destroyers *Swale*, *Ure*, and *Wear*. Forced lubrication is also being fitted to certain bearings of the new Battleships' and Cruisers' engines.

The conditions under which the Contractors' steam trials are to be run have been revised with a view to ensure that the conditions as regards lubrication, adjustment, number of men employed, and the closing of watertight doors, &c. shall be in agreement with the conditions obtaining on service. Several ships have lately satisfactorily run their trials under these conditions.

In view of the satisfactory results obtained from some of the ships of the *County* Class with a modified form of propeller, similar propellers have been provided for the whole of the Class, and have been fitted to all except the *Kent*, whose new blades are at Chatham ready for fitting in place.

The *Good Hope* has also been fitted with propellers of a modified design, and has carried out a series of comparative speed runs.

Standardisation.

By co-operation with the Machinery Contractors it has been found practicable to make almost the whole of the Main and Auxiliary Machinery and Boilers fitted in ships of the same class, of similar design and interchangeable, without diminishing the responsibility of the Contractors concerned.

APPENDIX I.

In the six First Class Armoured Cruisers of the *Duke of Edinburgh* Class this principle has been put into effect, and it is now in process of development for the machinery of ships of the *Lord Nelson* and *Minotaur* classes. By dealing with vessels in classes it is thus arranged that progress is not retarded by standardisation.

Admiralty Representatives having been associated with the various Sub-Committees of the Standards Committee, Admiralty and Commercial practice has been assimilated in many features, with benefit to each.

Ice-making Machinery.

In view of the importance of ensuring a supply of ice in hot climates and under war conditions, the output of the ice-making machines on all new vessels has been much increased.

Electrical Plant.

As a consequence of the extension of the application of electrical motors for capstan engines, boat, coal and ammunition hoists, ventilating and forced draught fans, &c., the capacity of the Electric Generating Plant fitted in new vessels has been greatly increased, and additional dynamo engines have been fitted in several Battleships of the *Majestic*, *Royal Sovereign*, *Canopus*, and *Formidable* classes, and are to be fitted in other vessels of these classes, and in First Class Cruisers of the *Cressy* Class, as they come in hand for large refit.

Liquid Fuel.

Since last year the Torpedo Boat Destroyer *Spiteful* and the Battleship *Prince George* have been fitted with oil burning installations ; the former burning liquid fuel solely, and the latter burning oil either alone or in conjunction with coal. Comparative trials between the sister Torpedo Boat Destroyers *Peterel* and *Spiteful* have also been made.

The Battleships *Mars* and *Hannibal*, and the Cruiser *Bedford* have been in commission continuously during the past year, with freedom from defect in their oil burning installations, which are fitted for burning oil alone or mixed with coal in a portion of their boilers.

WORK AT THE DOCKYARDS.

By the end of the current financial year all the Large Repairs arranged to be done by contract will be completed, and the arrears of this work, which had accumulated owing to the pressure of other important services in the Dockyards, quite cleared off. It is not anticipated that there will be any necessity to resort to the private trade for any considerable work of this character in 1905–6.

The development of Gibraltar Yard as a repairing base for the new Atlantic Fleet has been facilitated by the transfer there of some of the equipment not now required at other Yards abroad, while the Officers and Subordinate Staff have been mainly recruited from the same source. About 50 skilled workmen are being sent to Gilbraltar from Home Yards.

Good progress is being made with the work of installing Electric Light and Power in the Dockyards and other Naval Establishments. Most of the contracts for the various sections of the work have been placed, and the preparatory arrangements for the balance of the work are well advanced.

The replacement of obsolete machinery in the various Dockyards, &c., by machines of modern design and construction is proceeding satisfactorily.

APPENDIX I.

LARGE REPAIRS.

The following Ships have been or will be completed :—

By Dockyards.

Battleships.	First Class Cruisers.	Second Class Cruisers.
Majestic.	*Sutlej.*	**Gladiator.*
Prince George.	*Blenheim.*	**Vindictive*
Magnificent.	*Theseus.*	**Diana.*
Repulse.	*Edgar.*	**Talbot.*
Renown.		**Minerva*
Trafalgar.		
Nile.		
Barfleur.		

By Contract.

Battleships.	First Class Cruisers.	Second Class Cruisers.
Canopus.	*Argonaut.*	*Highflyer.*
Goliath.		
Glory (at Hong Kong).		

The most important of the refits to be carried out during 1905–6 are :—

Battleships :—

Hannibal.
Illustrious.
Mars.
Jupiter. Work commenced in 1904–5.

First Class Cruisers :—

Bacchante.
Aboukir.
Cressy.
Amphitrite.
Hawke.
Gibraltar.
Royal Arthur. Work commenced in 1904–5.

Second Class Cruisers :—

Eclipse. Including change of armament.
Furious.
Arrogant.
Charybdis.
Hermione.
Cambrian. Work commenced in 1904–5.

NEW WORKS.

WORKS PROVIDED IN ESTIMATES.

Chatham.—The Extension of Electrical Shop, and the Extension of Store for tubes for water-tube boilers have been completed. The conversion of Nos. 3 and 4 Slips into Boat Store will be completed in 1905–6. It has been decided not to proceed with the additional Fleet Reserve Workshop at Portsmouth provided for in Annual Estimates, 1904–5.

---

* Including change of armament.

APPENDIX I.

Sheerness.—Drainage Improvements and New Fitting Shop will be completed this year.

Portsmouth. The new Pumping Station at Docks Nos. 7 and 10, the New Chain Cable Store, the Connections, &c., to new 20-inch water mains, and the Extension of No. 13 Dock will be completed this year. The New Steam Factory will practically be completed in 1905–6.

The work of providing accommodation and storage in connection with Submarines is progressing.

Devonport.—The Chief Engineer's Drawing Office, &c., North Yard, has been completed. The railway lines round main Storehouses, South Yard, the Caisson for No. 2 Dock, and the renewals to Water Mains and Fire Service, North Yard, will be completed this year.

Haulbowline.—The Water Main from mainland, Houses for Constructor and Chief Engineer, and Machinery and Ship-fitting Shop will be completed in the year.

Malta.—Progress is being made with the work of renewing Wharf Walls in French and Dockyard Creeks, the Renewal of the buildings in connection with Hydraulic Dock will be completed this year.

Victualling Yards.—The Slaughter House at Chatham has been completed; the Cold Meat Store at Gibraltar, and the adaptation of War Department property for Victualling purposes at Malta will be completed in 1905–6. The provision of accommodation for Victualling Stores, &c., at Sidney is rendered unnecessary by the offer of the New South Males Government to provide the necessary storage at their own expense.

Naval Barracks and General Fleet Services.—Work on the Commander-in-Chief's Residence at Chatham has been begun, and should be finished in 1906–7. The Wei-hai-Wei Canteen will be completed this year and the Portland Canteen in 1905–6.

Marine Barracks.—The New Church and re-organisation of Drainage at Eastney; the improvements to Married Officers' Quarters at Plymouth; and the Reading and Recreation Rooms, North Barracks; and New Church at Deal will all be completed in 1905–6.

The conversion of Melville Hospital into Marine Barracks at Chatham, which could not be taken in hand in 1904–5, through the New Hospital not being ready, will be completed in 1906–7.

Prisons.—The New Warders' Quarters at the Corradino Prison, at Malta, will be completed, and the Prison on Garden Island, Sydney, early in 1905–6.

Hospitals.—The Drainage Improvements at Haslar have been completed. The new block for Officer Patients will practically be finished in 1904–5, and the adaptation and improvements of buildings in 1905–6. The improvements to three ward blocks at Plymouth will be completed in 1904–5, the wards for lunatics and prisoners in 1905–6, and improvements and alterations in 1906–7. The New General Hospital at Portland and additional accommodation at Queensferry will all be completed in the year, and the re-construction at Hong Kong early in 1905–6.

The additional accommodation and improvements at Gibraltar will be continued in 1905–6.

The Sanatorium at the Cape will be finished in 1905–6.

Osborne.—The new Cadets' College will be entirely completed in 1905–6.

APPENDIX I

The principal new Works in 905-6 are :—

Chatham.—Chain Testing House.
Improving and extending Dockyard Water Supply.
Alteration to railways at heads of Nos. 5 to 8 Docks.

Portsmouth.—Alteration to No. 5 Dock.
Quarters for Sub-Lieutenants and Captain (Whale Island).

Devonport.—New Buoy house.
New Machine Shop, Mutton Cove, South Yard.

Pembroke.—New Machine Workshop.

Deal.—Canteen for East Barracks.

Malta.—New Reservoir. New store houses at Corradino.

Generally.—Provision of accommodation and storage in connection with Submarines.
Storage for Lubricating Oil.

PROGRESS UNDER THE NAVAL WORKS LOAN ACTS.

Enclosure and Defence of Harbours.

Gibraltar.—The Admiralty Mole Extension and the detached Mole are completed and in use.

The dredging of the Harbour is completed except opposite the Dam.

The Commercial Mole will be shortly completed.

Dover.—The Admiralty Pier Extension, the East Arm and the East Reclamation are all completed, except the above-water work at the extremities of the Breakwaters. The South Breakwater has been commenced, and a short portion at the East end is up to water level.

Malta Breakwater.—The work has been greatly delayed by a succession of mishaps to the Contractor's plant and staging, in particular to damage caused by two gales.

Adapting Naval Ports, &c.

Keyham Dockyard Extension.—Docks 4, 5 and 6 are all nearly finished now.

The Entrance Lock is now well in hand.

Closed Basin.—Excavation about two-thirds completed.

Tidal Basin.—Excavation about one-half completed.

Main Wharf Walls.—Completed with the exception of some of the colunms.

Gibraltar Dockyard Extension.—No. 3 Dock (King Edward VII. Dock) is completed and available for docking Ships. The dimensions of the Dock are—Length, 450 feet, Width of Entrance, 95 feet, and Depth on Sill at Low Water, 35 feet 6 inches.

The Provision of Residences for the Officers and Artificers of the Yard has been begun.

Hong Kong Dockyard Extension.—The Reclamation in front of the Naval Yard and War Department properties is nearly completed. The Wharf Walls of the New Basin are practically finished. The Dock is in progress.

Simon's Bay Dockyard Extension.—The Breakwater and the Walls enclosing the New Basin are in hand. The Reclamation is in progress, and the Main Dam for the Dock is nearly closed.

APPENDIX I.

Malta Dockyard Extension.—Progress on the two new Docks being built by contract has not been at all satisfactory, the work at present being practically at a standstill owing to the breakdown of the Contractor's Pumping plant. The subsidiary works are being proceeded with as fast as the slow progress of the main Contract will permit.

Coaling Facilities.

Malta.—All the property necessary for coal storage has now been acquired; the required improvements are being carried out.

Gibraltar.—The Coal-Island is nearly finished and is partly in use.

Portland.—Good progress has been made with the work of extending the present Coaling Jetty, which is about half done. A commencement has also been made with the Oil Fuel storage, a contract having been let for two tanks.

Deepening Harbours and Approaches.

Portsmouth.—About three feet more have still to be dredged at the outer and inner bars. One more berth has been dredged and one other is nearly finished. The work on cruiser berths in Fountain Lake is being proceeded with as fast as possible; the second group of three is now about half done. The deepening of the Channel abreast of the *Assistance* berth is done, and the entance to Fountain Lake has been widened.

Devonport.—The new Dredger for which provision was made has been purchased and is now at work at Devonport.

Buildings, &c.

"*Britannia,*" *R.N. College.*—The main College will be available for the Naval Cadets, who will enter into occupation in September 1905. The subsidiary buildings, &c., are being pushed forward with all expedition, and satisfactory progress is being made.

Gibraltar.—The enlargement of the Dutch Shell Stores is nearly complete, and rapid progress is made with the Magazines at the east of the Ragged Staff.

Magazines.—The work on increased Magazine accommodation at Chatham, Devonport, Malta, and other places, is progressing steadily, and land has been bought near Gosport for the erection of Magazine accommodation to relieve Priddy's Hard.

Chatham Hospital.—Will be ready for occupation by the end of the year.

Electric Light and Power in Naval Establishments.—Contracts have been let for the Generating Stations at Chatham, Sheerness, Portsmouth, Devonport, Bull Point Magazines, Shotley, Gibraltar, Malta, and Cape Temporary Station, and work is in hand.

Sheerness Depot for Torpedo Boat Destroyers.—Workis well in hand, and tenders for the following works have been let, viz.:—Extension of No. 4 and 5 Docks, Trenches for Air Mains, Conversion of Mast House, &c., into Fitting Shops, Distilled Water Mains, Caisson at Basin Entrance, Electric Shop, Mast Shed, &c., Alterations to Dock Pumping Station, Navy Well, New Engine and Boiler House. Good progress is being made on these Contracts, and several minor works have been completed.

14.2.05. S.

APPENDIX II.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXLII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) House of Lords.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Advertisement Regulation [H.L.]	*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*	Read 2ª 9th March (865)
Bishopric of Bristol [H.L.]	*Lord Bishop of Bristol*	Committee Report 7th March (532) Read 3ª and passed 9th March (889)
*Congested Districts (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Marquess of Linlithgow*	Committee 6th March (386)
Continuation Schools [H.L.]	*Lord Bishop of Hereford*	Read 1ª 6th March (386)
Convocation of Clergy [H.L.]	*Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*	Read 1ª 9th March (863)
*Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1ª 3rd March (298) Read 2ª 13th March (1166)
*Military Manœuvres [H.L.]	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 2ª 2nd March (151) Committee 9th March (875)
*Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydvil Scheme Confirmation) [H.L.]	*Marquess of Londonderry*	Read 2ª 2nd March (151)
*Naval Prize [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1ª 9th March (900) Read 2ª 13th March (1167)
Newcastle Chapter Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Bishop of St. Albans*	Read 2ª 6th March (387) Committee Report 13th March (1131)
*Prevention of Corruption [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1ª 3rd March (298) Read 2ª 13th March (1164)
*Prize Courts [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1ª 9th March (900) Read 2ª 13th March (1166)
Public Meeting (Facilities) [H.L.]	*Lord Burghclere*	Read 1ª 9th March (863)
*Reserve Forces [H.L.]	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 3ª and passed 2nd March (161)

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Sale of Intoxicants to Children [H.L.]	*Lord Dunboyne*	Read 2ª 7th March (531) Committee Report 9th March (889) Read 3ª and passed 10th March (1042)
Street Betting [H.L.]	*Lord Davey*	Committee 2nd March (159)
Sunday Closing (Shops) [H.L.]	*Lord Avebury*	Read 2ª 14th March (1334)
*Whale Fisheries (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Marquess of Linlithgow*	Read 1ª 9th March (862)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Accidents (Mines and Factories)	*Mr. Cochrane*	Read 1º 1st March (29)
Agricultural Education in Elementary Schools	*Mr. Jesse Collings*	Read 1º 9th March (947)
Agricultural Holdings	*Mr. Channing*	Read 1º 13th March (1230)
*Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, &c., Continuance	*Mr. Long*	Read 1º 9th March (947)
Compensation for Damage to Crops	*Mr. Mount*	Read 2º 3rd March (345)
Criminal New Trials	*Mr. Bousfield*	Read 1º 8th March (855)
Crofters' Holdings (Scotland)	*Mr. Cathcart Wason*	Read 1º 9th March (946)
*Dogs	*Mr. Fellowes*	Read 1º 8th March (734)
Education Authorities (Access to Books and Documents)	*Sir Albert Rollit*	Read 1º 10th March (1127)
*Education (Scotland)	*The Lord Advocate*	Read 1º 8th March (735)
*Government Ships	*Mr. Pretyman*	Read 1º 1st March (30)
Juvenile Smoking	*Dr. Macnamara*	Read 1º 14th March (1332)
Light Railways	*Mr. Gerald Balfour*	Read 1º 2nd March (205)
Local Authorities Officers	*Sir Joseph Leese*	Read 1º 10th March (1127)
Local Authorities (Transfer of Treasury Powers)	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Read 1º 7th March (600)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment	*Mr. Cathcart Wason*	Read 1° 2nd March (205)
*Marine Insurance	*Mr. Attorney-General*	Read 1° 8th March (734)
*Merchant Shipping	*Mr. Gerald Balfour*	Read 1° 2nd March (205)
Municipal Franchise	*Sir Albert Rollitt*	Bill withdrawn 3rd March (377)
*Naval Lands (Volunteers)	*Mr. Pretyman*	Read 1° 1st March (30)
*Open Spaces	*Mr. Fellowes*	Read 1° 8th March (735)
Public Health	*Sir Alfred Hickman*	Read 1° 1st March (29)
Public Libraries Acts (Extension)	*Sir James Rankin*	Read 1° 1st March (29)
Public Trustee and Executor	*Sir Howard Vincent*	Read 2° 3rd March (374)
Sale of Intoxicants to Children	*Sir John Dorrington*	Read 1° 13th March (1332)
Sale of Whisky	*Sir Herbert Maxwell*	Read 1° 14th March (1398)
Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies)	*Sir Harry Samuel*	Read 2° 3rd March (323)
Shop Clubs	*Mr. Broadhurst*	Read 1° 7th March (600)
*Telegraph (Construction)	*Lord Stanley*	Read 1° 9th March (947)
Tied Houses Abolition	*Mr. Broadhurst*	Read 1° 7th March (600)
Town Holdings	*Mr. Channing*	Read 1° 13th March (1230)
Trade Marks	*Mr. Moulton*	Read 1° 1st March (147)
Trades Unions and Trade Disputes	*Mr. Whittaker*	Read 2° 10th March (1054)
Vaccination	*Mr. Stanhope*	Read 1° 2nd March (205)
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Amendment	*Mr. Shackleton*	Read 1° 8th March (734)

APPENDIX III.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1905.

List of Rules, Orders, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

In Continuation of List given in proceeding Volume.

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Education (Scotland) (Code 1905),—Copy of Code of Regulations for Day Schools, with Appendices, by the Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education in Scotland [35 and 36 Vic., c. 62, s. 67]	10 March	One month
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of University College, Oxford, on 26th November, 1904, amending Statute III. (" The Fellows ") of the Statutes of the College [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50]	13 March	12 weeks
Public Records (Inland Revenue Department (Estate Duty Office),—Copy of Schedule containing a list and Particulars of Classes and Documents in the Department of the Inland Revenue (Estate Duty Office) which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [40 and 41 Vic., c. 55, s. 1]	14 March	4 weeks

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION 1904.

MARCH 1—MARCH 14.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. = *As.* = Answers *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Rep. Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen, Earl of
  Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 14*, 1349–1351.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]
  Kingston Estate, Particulars as to Sale of, *Mar. 9*, 907.
  Morgan, P. S., Purchase of Estate of—Case of J. J. Greene, *Mar. 9*, 934.

Accidents
  Gas in Contact with Leakage of Electricity, Number of Accidents due to.
    Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13*, 1190.
  Mines, in.
    Returns as to—Inclusion of Accidents for which Compensation is paid by Employers, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1051.
  Poisons, Sale of, Precautions against.
    Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13*, 1191.
    Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13*, 1204.
  Railways, *see under that title.*

Accidents (Mines and Factories) Bill
  c. 1R.* *Mar. 1*, 29.

Achill Island
  Darby's Point, Extension of Pier at, Proposals as to.
    Qs. Dr. Ambrose; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8*, 705; *Mar. 14*, 1385.

Achintee River
  Footbridge across, Construction of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 6*, 412, 413.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A.—*Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury* [Somerset, Wellington]
  Agriculture, Board of—Date of Appointing President, *Mar. 9*, 1040.
  Business of the House, Course of, *Mar. 8*, 855, 856; *Mar. 13*, 1332.
  Ireland, Chief Secretaryship for—Resignation of Mr. Wyndham, *Mar. 2*, 296; *Mar. 6*, 528; *Mar. 9*, 1040.
  Fiscal Policy—Taxation of Food—Mr. Churchill's Motion, Attitude of Government towards, *Mar. 7*, 696.
  Navy Estimates, Date of taking, *Mar. 3*, 384.

Acton
  Polling District, Division of—Order Presented, *Mar. 2*, 150, 164.

Admiralty
  First Lord—Earl of Cawdor.
  Financial Secretary—Mr. Pretyman.
  Board—Distribution of Business, Statement, etc.

[*cont.*

Admiralty—*cont.*
Board—*cont.*
Circulation of.
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr Pretyman, *Mar 6*, 403, 404.
Presented, *Mar. 6*, 385, 390.
Changes at, Terms of Order in Council, etc.
Os. Sir J. Colomb, *Mar. 6*, 477–480; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7*, 608–611; Mr. Pretyman, 1258; Lord G. Hamilton, 1267, 1268.
Constitution and Organisation of, Successful Working of
O. Sir J. Colomb, *Mar. 6*, 477.
"Enchantress" Yacht, *see under* Navy.
First Sea Lord, Office of, Information as to Changes in.
Os. Sir J. Colomb, *Mar. 6*, 479, 480; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7*, 610, 611; Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13*, 1241; Mr. Pretyman, 1258, 1259; Lord G. Hamilton, 1267.
Presence of, on Committees, Importance of.
O. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 441.
Inspector of Target Practice for the Fleet, Duties, *Status*, and Emoluments of, etc.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 443; Sir J. Colomb, 479, 480; Mr. Kearley, 481; Mr. R. Lucas, 518; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*, 1259, 1260; Mr. G. Bowles, 1260; Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 14*, 1414.
Intelligence Department—Advisability of Keeping Officer always on Duty.
O. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 306, 307.

Advertisements Regulation Bill
l. 2R., *Mar. 9*, 865.
Debate on Second Reading [Lords], *Mar. 9*, 865.
Advertisement, Definition of, 872, 874.
Control over Existing Methods of Advertising, Necessity for, 866, 870, 871–874.
Edinburgh, Case of, 868, 869, 872.
Local Authorities, Granting Powers to, proposed, 866, 867, 870–874.
Scenery in Town and Country Defaced by Advertisements, 866, 867, 872.

Africa, Central
Convention between United Kingdom and France as to, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 150.

Africa, South
[*For particular Colonies, see their names.*]
Freights—Boots and Shoes, Shipping rates on.
Q. Sir C. McLaren; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 8*, 717.

Africa, South—*cont.*
Garrison in.
Constabulary duty done by, alleged.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *Mar. 2*, 243; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 243, 245, 250, 254; Mr. Ainsworth, 252; Mr. Lloyd-George, 252; Sir R. Reid, Mr. Labouchere, 254.
Cost of maintenance of.
O. Mr. B. Davenport, *Mar. 2*, 209.
Horses, Excess Number of.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2*, 246.
Number of Troops required.
Os. Sir R. Reid, *Mar. 2*, 241; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 245.
Stores, Sale of—Report of Public Accounts Committee
O. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 2*, 218, 219.
Unpopularity of the Service.
Os. Captain Norton, *Mar. 2*, 239; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 244.
High Commissioner.
Milner, Lord, Resignation of.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill,; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 1*, 29.
Reasons for retirement of.
Os. Mr. Kier-Hardie, *Mar. 6*, 493; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 500.
Powers of.
Qs. Mr. Bryce; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 9*, 945.
Qualifications essential in holder of.
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 6*, 504; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 507, 508.
Selborne, Earl of, appointment of.
Conditions of.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 428, 429.
Motion for Adjournment of the House, [Mr. S. MacNeill] *Mar. 6*, 432, 491.
Political Objections to.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Mar. 6* 492; Mr. K. Hardie, 493; Mr. Purvis, 494; Mr. Markham, 495; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 496–502; Mr. S. Buxton, 503–505, Mr. J. Chamberlain, 506, 509, 510; Mr. Cawley, 511; Major Seely, 512, 513.
Qualifications for Office, etc.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 2*, 201, 202.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 501; Mr. S. Buxton, 502.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 428.
Representative Institutions, Power to deal with.
Os. Mr. Markham, *Mar. 6*, 495, 498; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 498, 499

[*cont.*

Africa, South—*cont.*
High Commissioner—*cont.*
Selborne, Earl of, appointment of—*cont.*
Salary of.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6,* 428.

Land Settlement in—Acreage Required, Cost of Land, Number of Settlers, etc.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 7,* 570.

Native affairs, Commission on— Tabling Report, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 9,* 904.

Railways taken over by the military, Payment for.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *Mar. 1,* 3.
Qs. Mr. Whitley, Sir R. Reid, Mr. S. Buxton; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1,* 16, 17.

War Compensation Claims, Settlement of, Number of claims outstanding, etc.
Qs. Mr. Ainsworth; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8,* 711, 712.

Sugar Bounties, Abolition of.
Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 1,* 12.

Africa, West
Convention between United Kingdom and France as to, Presented, *Mar. 2;* 150.

Ibadan, Terms of holding Land at.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 2,* 181.

Aghnacliffe
Postal Arrangements, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14,* 1361.

Agricultural Education in Elementary Schools Bill
c. 1R.*, *Mar. 9,* 947.

Agricultural Holdings Bill
c. 1R.*, *Mar. 13,* 1230.

Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance Bill
c. 1R.*, *Mar 9,* 947.

Agriculture, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. A. E. Fellowes.
President, Date of Appointing.
Qs. Mr. Dalziel, *Mar. 9,* 1039; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 1040.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Duties and Powers of.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 20, 21.
rievances of Staff, Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6,* 420.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 934.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland—*cont.*
Inspectors— Miss Anderson, Qualifications of, and Terms of Appointment.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 589, 590.

Instructors, Regulations as to Allocation of.
Qs. Mr. H. Law, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14,* 1386, 1387.

Irish Industries, Protection of, in British Markets.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 23.

Potatoes, Seed, Experiments for Improvement of, proposed.
O. Mr. Hayden, *Mar. 14,* 1468.

Schemes—Return Presented, *Mar. 1,* 2.

Salaries—Increase, Treasury sanction to.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14,* 1389, 1390.

Veterinary Branch—Position of Clerks,
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 22, 27; *Mar. 9,* 926.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
Africa, South.
Garrison in, Constabulary Duty done by, Alleged, *Mar. 2,* 252.
War compensation claims, Settlement of, *Mar. 8,* 711, 712.

Clyde River, Naval Vessels anchored in, Nuisance caused by, *Mar. 7,* 619, 620; *Mar. 9,* 916, 917; *Mar. 13,* 1199.

"Albert"
Wreck of—Removal and Payment of compensation for damage, proposed.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 6,* 396.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1189.

Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucester, Stroud]
Turkey.
European Provinces of, Tabling correspondence relating to, proposed, *Mar. 9,* 919.
Villages destroyed by Troops—Number rebuilt, *Mar. 9,* 920.

Aliens
Naturalisation of, During 1904—Return Ordered, *Mar. 13,* 1330.

Percentage of, in receipt of Poor Law Relief.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 8,* 704.

Prisons, Number in, etc.
Qs. Sir T. Dewar, Mr. Lough; *A* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13,* 1203, 1204.

Aliens Bill
Date of Intrdouction.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6,* 425.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
  Achill Island—Extension of Pier at Darby's Point, Proposals as to, *Mar. 8*, 705; *Mar. 14*, 1385.
  Burrishoole—Negotiations for sale of estate of Mr. Jones, *Mar. 6*, 400.
  Gun Licence, Refusal of, to J. Murphy, *Mar. 1*, 8.
  Mayo.
    Marine Works, Progress with, *Mar. 6*, 399.
    Relief Works in Distressed Districts, *Mar. 6*, 399.
  Postmasters, Nationality and religious denominations of, *Mar. 8*, 701.

Ambulance Service
  Metropolitan, Improvement of.
    Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 1*, 5.

Ancient Monuments, Ireland
  St. Mels Cathedral, Preservation of.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 13*, 1192.

Andover Lighting and Power Bill
  c. 2R.* *Mar 1*, 1.

Anson, Sir W. R.—*Secretary to the Board of Education* [Oxford University]
  Broughton Gifford School, Building Grant to, *Mar. 3*, 318.
  Education (Local Authority Default) Act, 1904, Application of, *Mar. 7*, 578.
  Girls' Public Day School Company, Profits of. Grant paid to, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1208.
  Grants—Conditional Payment on Medical Inspection of Children in Elementary Schools, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 398.
  Irish language, Teaching of, in Schools, *Mar. 7*, 578.
  King's Scholars.
    Applications for entrance to Residential Colleges, *Mar. 7*, 560.
    Places available for, *Mar. 2*, 170.
  Nymphsfield—Decision as to St. Joseph's Catholic School, *Mar. 8*, 720, 721; *Mar. 14*, 1379.
  Schools.
    Attendance.
      Circular 512, Enforcement of, *Mar. 9*, 912.
      Employment of Children for in-gathering of crops, Regulations as to, *Mar. 7*, 559.
      Residence outside Local Authority's area, Regulation as to, *Mar. 9*, 912.
    Secondary—Fees and free places—Representations as to restrictions, *Mar. 7*, 577; *Mar 13*, 1209.
  Training Colleges—Accommodation for Women Students, *Mar. 14*, 1363.
  Underfed Children, Proposals as to, *Mar. 13*, 1185.

Appleby
  Parliamentary Election — New Member Sworn, *Mar. 6*, 432.

Appropriations-in-Aid
  Colonial Information as to.
    Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 2*, 219; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 222.
  System of, Objections to.
    Os. Mr. Guest, *Mar. 1*, 43; Mr. G. Bowles, 63, 64, 66; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 88; Mr. Davenport, *Mar. 2*, 207.

Archdale Estate
  Sale of, Offer for.
    Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 924.

Ardagh
  St. Mels Cathedral, Protection of.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 13*, 1192.

Arklow
  Postmaster, Appointment of.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 6*, 425.
    Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 939, 940.

Armagh
  Catholic Demonstration by Clovenden Band, Route of.
    Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14*, 1385, 1386.
  Post Office—Case of Mr. R. J. M'Cusker.
    Q. Mr. Jno. Campbell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 6*, 397.

Armaments
  Expenditure on, Increase in.
    Os. Mr. Labouchere, *Mar. 14*, 1425–1427.

Army
  Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
  Under Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore.
  Financial Secretary—W. B. Davenport.
  Army Corps Scheme—Cost of, amount remaining on Vote.
    Os. Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 2*, 231, 232; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 232.
  Artillery.
    Officers—Regulations as to appointment to Royal Horse Artillery after five years' service.
      Q. Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13*, 1180.
    Re-armament of, Progress made with, etc.
      O. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1*, 83.
    Committee on—Date of appointment.
      Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *Mar. 1*, 11.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Barracks.

Belfast—Closing of Trainfield Gate.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1179, 1180.

China, in, for British Troops.
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1175.

Department, Discharge of employees from.
Q. Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1178, 1179.

Woolwich, Works at—Provision for Married Soldiers.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1181.

Colonial Defence (*for particular Colonies see Names of Colonies*).

Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 39; Sir R. Reid, 58.

Conditions of Service, Changes in, since 1895.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1197.

Contracts.

Africa, South, *see* South African War—Stores and Supplies.

Forage, Non-delivery of—Authority for payment of Compensation.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 180.

Establishment.

Reduction in, proposed.
Os. Mr. B. Davenport, *Mar. 2,* 209; Sir A. Hayter, 217; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 221, 224; Sir R. Reid, 241; Mr. Churchill, 248, 249; Mr. C. Warner, 251.

Strength of.
Q. Maj. Seely; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9,* 918.

Expenditure.

Colonial Defence, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 39; Sir R. Reid, 58.

Increase in.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 32; Mr. McCrae, 75.

Reduction in, necessity for.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 41; Mr. Guest, 47; Mr. G. Bowles, 66; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 244; Mr. J. Walton, 252.

Foreign Service, Number and cost of troops serving on.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 38, 39; Sir R. Reid, 59.

Guards' Brigade, Shortage of Officers in—Proposals as to filling vacancies.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 14,* 1368.

Army—*cont.*

Guns.

Contracts for—Private firms—Regulations as to tests and specifications.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 7,* 567, 568.

Designs, New, Date of ordering trial guns, etc.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 1,* 12.

Orders for, allocation of.
Qs. Capt. Norton, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 177.

Payment for, method of.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 177.

Proportion of field guns to sabres, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 3,* 323.

Hanley, Private J., Case of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *Mar. 8,* 701.

Highland Regiments, Grouping of, Under New Depot Scheme.
Qs. Master of Elibank, Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 8,* 706.

Horses, Epizootic Lymphangitis Among, *see under* Horses.

King's Own Scottish Borderers, 1st Battalion—Cost of Moving from Belfast to Newry, Cost of Field Training, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Foster, *Mar. 14,* 1366.

Lists and Muster Rolls transferred to Public Record Office, Stipulations as to.
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9,* 916.

Loan Works Bills, Objections to System of.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 36, 37.

London, Defence of, *see under* London.

Manœuvres—Holidays and Saints Days in Ireland, Exemption of, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1181.

Medical Establishments—Pay, etc., Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 206; *Mar. 7,* 630; *Mar. 8,* 741.

Miscellaneous Effective Services, Vote for, *Mar, 2,* 206; *Mar. 7.* 630; *Mar. 8,* 741.

Nine Years' Service System, Proposals as to.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 2,* 217; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 221; Capt. Norton, 237, 238; Mr. Churchill, 247.

Information as to.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9,* 17, 918.

Army—*cont.*

Nine Years' Service System—*cont.*

Reserve, Effect on.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 7,* 631, 635; Mr. Churchill, 634; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 636, 637.

Officers.

Artillery—Regulations as to Appointment to Royal Horse Artillery after Five Years Service.
Q. Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1180.

Guards' Brigade, Shortage in—Proposals as to Filling Vacancies, *Mar. 14,* 1368.

Japan, Residence and Study in—Applications and Appointments.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Master of Elibank; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 178, 179.

Ordnance Factories.

Enfield Small Arms Factory—Number of Persons Employed, Rate of Pay, Cost of Manufacturing Arms, etc.—Return Ordered, *Mar. 9,* 1037.

Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory.

Establishment, Reduction of.
Qs. Mr. Whitley; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 14,* 1372.

Number of Persons Employed, Rate of Pay, Cost of Manufacturing Arms, etc.—Return Ordered, *Mar. 9,* 1037; *Mar. 14,* 1372.

Organisation—Annual Report, Presented, *Mar. 1,* 3; *Mar. 2,* 150.

Pay and Allowances.

Changes in, Since 1895.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1197.

Civilians Attached to Units, of, Increase in Vote for.
Os. Mr. O'Mara, *Mar. 2,* 285; Mr. J. Walton, 287; Mr. B. Davenport, 287, 288, 290, 291; Mr. M'Crae, 287, 290, 291; Mr. Mooney, 287; Mr. Lough, Mr. Dalziel, 288; Sir A. Hayter, 289; Capt. Norton, 290; Mr. Weir, 292.

Deferred, Amount of, Information as to.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 2,* 217; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 221; Mr. McKenna, 257, 258; Sir F. Banbury, 259; Capt. Norton, 260; Col. Welby, 261, 262; Col. Legge, 262, 263; Mr. Renwick, 263, 264; Mr. H. Robertson, 264, 265; Col. Pilkington, 266.

Army—*cont.*

Pay and Allowances—*cont.*

Privates, Maximum of.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 14,* 1367.

Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other non-effective Charges, Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 206; *Mar. 7,* 630; *Mar. 8,* 741.

Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 206; *Mar. 7,* 630; *Mar. 8,* 741.

Increase in.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 2,* 242.

Pensions and other Non-Effective Charges, Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 206; *Mar. 7,* 631; *Mar. 8,* 741.

Period of Service, Reasons for Limitation of, to Twelve Years.
Os. Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 7,* 635; Mr. G. Bowles, 638; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 641.

Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies, Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 206; *Mar. 7,* 630; *Mar. 8,* 741.

Recruiting and Enlistment

Annual Number of Recruits Required under Nine Years' System, etc.
Q. Maj. Seely; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9,* 917.

Home Service Army, Opening for.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *Mar. 1,* 11.

London Barracks, Removal of, from St. George's, Progress of Negotiations as to Purchase of Site, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 10,* 1053.

Particulars of, since 1895.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1197.

Report, Annual, Presented, *Mar. 1,* 3; *Mar. 2,* 150.

Regimental Allowances and Expenses, Increase in Vote for.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, Mr. Weir, Mr. J. Walton, *Mar. 2*; 281; Mr. B. Davenport, 282.

Reorganisation Proposals.
Os. Mr. Churchill, *Mar. 2,* 247, 248; Mr. J. Walton, 252; Major Seely, *Mar. 7,* 639.

Army Council, Policy of.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 7,* 568.

Financial Aspect of.
O. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 2,* 229.

Reserve.

Estimate for.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 2,* 217; Mr. C. Warner, 632, 634; Mr. O'Mara, 632, 633; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 633; Mr. Churchill, 634; Mr. G. Bowles, 638

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Reserve—*cont.*
Progress made with, Retardation of, by Adoptionof Nine Years' Service System.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar.* 7, 631; Mr. Churchill, 634; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 636, 637.

Special Reserve, Information as to.
Os. Mr. Churchill, *Mar.* 7, 639; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 641.

Strength of.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar.* 7, 631; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 633, 641; Captain Norton, 639.

Vote for, Proposed Reduction of.
Os. Mr. Labouchere, *Mar.* 7, 641; Mr. Chairman, Mr. Churchill, *Mar.* 7, 642.

Rifle Clubs and Rifle Ranges, *see those titles.*

Rifles.

Long, Adaptation of, for clip loading.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 6, 402.

New

Information as to.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 1, 11.

Orders, Information as to.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 6, 405.

Small Arms Factory views on Specifications.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 2, 177.

Russo-Japanese War, British Officers attached to belligerent forces, *see under* Russo-Japanese War.

Short Service Scheme, Decision as to.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar,* 9, 917, 918.

Staff, proposed Changes in.
Os. Sir J. Fergusson, *Mar.* 2, 212; Colonel Welby, 212, 213; Mr. C. Warner, 223; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 227, 228; Mr. McCrae, Mr. C. Hobhouse, 232.

Expenditure for, Increase in—Dual Appointments, etc.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar* 2, 217; Mr. Whitley, 220; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 222, 228; Mr. Churchill, 225. 226, 228, 230, 231; Mr. B. Davenport, 225, 226; Mr. C. Warner, 228; Mr. McCrae, 230.

Staff College Appointments, Allocation of.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar,* 2, 179.

Army—*cont.*
Submarine Mining, Discontinuance of—Utilisation of Services of Officers, etc., of Mining Divisions.
Q. Sir A. Rollit; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar* 6, 405.
Q. Sir C. Palmer; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 13, 1178.

Three Years' System, Failure of—Stoppage of Recruiting.
Os. Mr. B. Davenport, *Mar.* 2, 209; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 246, 247.

Transport and Remounts, Vote for, *Mar.* 2, 206; *Mar.* 7, 630; *Mar.* 8, 741.

Uniforms, Changes in, Information as to.
Q. Sir C. Rasch, *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 2, 177, 178.

Army Estimates

Date of Taking.
Os. Mr. Bryce, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* 13, 1229.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 9, 946.

Discussion of, Facilities for.
Os. Major Seely, *Mar.* 14, 1508, 1509; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1509.

Effective and Non-effective Services—Presented, *Mar.* 9, 903.

Increase in, Causes of.
Q. Mr. Lambert, *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 14, 1367.

Memorandum of Secretary of State Presented, *Mar.* 10, 1047; *Mar.* 13, 1131.

Ordnance Factories—Presented, *Mar.* 9, 903.

Supplementary.

Medical Establishments, Pay, etc., £21,000, *Com.*, *Mar.* 2, 206; *Mar.* 7, 630.

Miscellaneous Effective Services £2,000, *Com.*, *Mar.* 2, 206; *Mar.* 7, 630.

Objections to System of.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar.* 2, 240.

Pay—£985,000, *Com.*, *Mar.* 2, 206; *Mar.* 7, 630; *Mar.* 8, 741.

Pensions and other Non-effective Charges—£2,000, *com.*, *Mar.* 2, 206; *Mar.* 7, 631.

Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies—£260,000, *com.*, *Mar.* 2, 206; *Mar.* 7, 630.

Retired Pay, Half-Pay, and other Non-effective Charges — £1,000 *Com.*, *Mar.* 2, 206; *Mar.* 7, 630

South African War, Increase in Estimates due to, amount of.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar.* 2, 219.

Transport and Remounts—£265,000 *Com.*, *Mar.* 2, 206; *Mar.* 7, 630

Surpluses on one Vote Applied to Reduction on another—Objections to system.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *Mar.* 2, 219, 220, 242.

Tabling, Date of.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* 7, 568.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.—*Secretary of State for War* [Belfast, W.]
Africa, South.
Garrison in.
Constabulary Duty done by, alleged, *Mar. 2*, 243, 245, 250.
Horses, Excess Number of, *Mar. 2*, 246.
Number of Troops required, *Mar. 2*, 245.
Unpopularity of the Service, *Mar. 2*, 244.
Railways taken over by the military, Payment for, *Mar. 1*, 3.
Army Corps Scheme, Cost of, Amount remaining on Vote, *Mar. 2*, 232.
Athlone—Curramore Bog purchased by War Office—Payment of Awards, *Mar. 9*, 941.
Artillery.
Armament—Committee on, Date of Appointment of, *Mar. 1*, 11.
Officers—Regulations as to Appointment to Royal Horse Artillery after Five Years' Service, *Mar. 13*, 1180.
Barracks.
Belfast—Closing of Trainfield Gate, *Mar. 13*, 1180.
China, in, for British Troops, *Mar. 13*, 1175.
Department, Discharge of employees from, *Mar. 13*, 1179.
Woolwich, Works at—Provision for Married Soldiers, *Mar. 13*, 1181.
Business of the House, Absence of Prime Minister from Debates, etc., *Mar. 2*, 276.
Cape Colony Customs Duties—Claim for Rebate on Articles purchased during the War, *Mar. 2*, 176,
Colonial Appropriations-in-Aid, *Mar. 2*, 222.
Conditions of Service, Changes in, since 1895, *Mar. 13*, 1197.
Contracts—Forage, Non-Delivery of—Authority for Payment of Compensation, *Mar. 2*, 180.
Crimean War—Ex-Sergeant Martin, Claim of, for increase of Pension, *Mar. 14*, 1369.
Establishment.
Reduction in, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 221, 244.
Strength of, *Mar. 9*, 918.
Estimates.
Date of taking, *Mar. 9*, 946.
Increase in, Causes of, *Mar. 14*, 1367.
Tabling, Date of, *Mar. 7*, 568.
Ex-Soldiers, Employment of, in Government Offices, *Mar. 13*, 1179.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.—*cont.*
Expenditure, Necessity for Reduction in, *Mar. 2*, 244.
Guards' Brigade, Shortage of Officers in—Proposals as to filling Vacancies, *Mar. 14*, 1368.
Guns.
Contracts for—Private Firms—Regulations as to Tests and Specifications, *Mar. 7*, 568.
Designs, Date of Ordering Trial Guns, etc., *Mar. 1*, 12.
Orders for, Allocation of, *Mar. 2*, 177.
Payment for, Method of, *Mar. 2*, 177.
Proportion of Field Guns to Sabres, etc., *Mar. 3*, 323.
Highland Regiments, Grouping of, under new Depot Scheme, *Mar. 8*, 706.
Indian Army, Reserve for, Arrangement as to, *Mar. 7*, 637.
Kings' Own Scottish Borderers, 1st Battalion—Cost of Moving from Belfast to Newry, etc., *Mar. 14*, 1366.
Lists and Muster Rolls, Old—Conditions of Tansfer to Public Record Office, *Mar. 9*, 916.
London, Defence of—Expenditure on Earthworks on Surrey Hills, *Mar. 14*. 1368.
Malta, Garrison in, Reduction in, proposed *Mar. 2*, 221.
Manœuvres, Holding, on Saints' Days, etc., in Ireland, alleged, *Mar. 13*, 1181.
Nine Years' Service System, Proposals as to, *Mar. 2*, 221; *Mar. 7*, 636, 637; *Mar. 9*, 918.
Officers.
Artillery—Regulations as to Appointment to Royal Horse Artillery after Five Years' Service, *Mar. 13*, 1180.
Guards' Brigade, Shortage in, *Mar. 14*, 1368.
Japan, Residence and Study in—Applications and Appointments, *Mar. 2*, 178, 179.
Ordnance Factories—Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory, Reduction in Establishment of, *Mar. 14*, 1372.
Pay.
Changes in, since 1895, *Mar. 13*, 1197.
Deferred, Amount of, Information as to, *Mar. 2*, 221.
Privates, Maximum of, *Mar. 14*, 1367.
Period of Service, Reasons for limiting to twelve years, *Mar. 7*, 641.
Recruiting and Enlistment.
Annual number of Recruits Required under Nine Years' System, *Mar. 9*, 917.

[*cont.*

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.—*cont.*
Recruiting and Enlistment—*cont.*
Home Service Army, Opening for, *Mar. 1*, 11.
London Barracks, Removal of, Progress of Negotiations, *Mar. 10*, 1053.
Number enlisted since 1895, *Mar. 13*, 1197.
Reorganisation—Army Council, Policy of, *Mar. 7*, 568.
Reserve.
Estimate for, *Mar. 7*, 633.
Nine Years' Service System, Effect of, on the Reserve, *Mar. 7*, 636, 637.
Special Reserve, Position of, *Mar. 7*, 641.
Strength of, *Mar. 7*, 633, 641.
Rifle Clubs, Government Assistance to, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1054.
Rifle Ranges—Whitchurch (Gloucestershire)—Cost, Decision as to Abandonment, etc., *Mar. 9*, 918, 919.
Rifles.
Long, Adaptation of, for Clip Loading, *Mar. 6*, 402.
New.
Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 11.
Orders for, Information as to, *Mar. 6*, 405.
Small Arms Factory views on Specifications for, *Mar. 2*, 177.
Short Service Scheme, Decision as to, *Mar. 9*, 918.
Somaliland—Arming of Natives, proposal as to, *Mar. 8*, 782.
Somaliland Expedition.
Administration of the Country, Government Policy as to, etc. *Mar. 8*, 778–782.
Conduct of Operations, etc., *Mar. 8*, 780–782.
Expenditure on, *Mar. 1*, 9.
Estimate for, *Mar. 2*, 233.
Total Cost, *Mar. 2*, 180.
South African War.
Cost of, Increase in Supplementary Estimates due to, etc., *Mar. 2*, 222.
Stores and Supplies.
Jam—Deficiency in Weight supplied, *Mar. 13*, 1182.
Report of Comptroller and Auditor-General, *Mar. 14*, 1370, 1371.
Staff.
Changes proposed in, *Mar. 2*, 227, 228, 232.
Expenditure for, Increase in—Dual Appointments, etc., *Mar. 2*, 222, 228.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.—*cont.*
Staff College Appointments, Allocation of, *Mar. 2*, 179.
Submarine Mining, Discontinuance of—Utilisation of Services of Officers, etc., of Mining Divisions, *Mar. 6*, 405; *Mar. 13*, 1178.
Three Years System, Stoppage of Recruiting for, *Mar. 2*, 246, 247.
Transvaal, Chinese Labour in—British Soldiers Employed in Suppressing Riots and Bringing Back Deserters, Alleged, *Mar. 2*, 243, 247, 250, 253, 254.
Uniforms, Changes in, *Mar. 2*, 178.
Volunteers.
Appointments, October to December 1903 and 1904, *Mar. 13*, 1196.
Fourth West York Artillery, *Mar. 14*, 1366.
Grants to, Changes Proposed in, *Mar. 14*, 1367.
Incidence, Changes Proposed in, *Mar. 7*, 567.
Officers, Schools of Instruction for, *Mar. 13*, 1198.
Resignations, October to December 1903 and 1904, *Mar. 13*, 1196.
War Office.
Ex-Soldiers Employed in. *Mar. 13*, 1179.
Financial Department, Reorganisation of, *Mar. 2*, 222.

Arnott Estate
Apportionment of, for Sale Purposes, Alleged.
Qs. Mr. Crean; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8*, 726, 727.

Artillery
see under Army.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]
Fiscal Policy—Preferential Treatment for Colonies, Food Taxation, etc., *Mar. 8*, 844–850.
Scottish Church Property Dispute, *Mar. 14*, 1394.
Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R., *Mar. 10*, 1092–1098.

Assizes
Spring—Orders Presented, *Mar. 2*, 150; *Mar. 3*, 317.

Athboy
St. James' Mixed National School Residence, Expenditure on.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1195, 1196.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
District Railway, Electrification of—Provision as to Driver's Assistant, *Mar. 9*, 907.
Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar 3*, 346.
Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R. *Mar. 10*, 1085–1090, 1102.

Athlone

Curramore Bog Purchased by War Office—Payment of Compensation Awards.

Qs. Mr. Hayden; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9*, 940, 941.

Labourers' Cottages Scheme, Decision as to.

Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 909.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.– *Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]

Achill Island—Extension of Pier at Darby's Point, Proposals as to, *Mar. 8*, 705; *Mar. 14*, 1385.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department.

Duties and Powers of, *Mar. 1*, 20, 21.

Grievances of Staff, Inquiry into, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 420; *Mar. 9*, 934.

Industries, Irish, Protection of, in British Markets, *Mar. 1*, 23.

Inspectors—Miss E. Anderson, Qualifications, etc., of, *Mar. 7*, 590.

Instructors, Regulations as to Allocation of, *Mar. 14*, 1386, 1387.

Salaries, Increase in, *Mar. 14*, 1390.

Veterinary Branch Clerks, Position of, *Mar. 1*, 22; *Mar. 9*, 926.

Archdale Estate, Offer for Sale of, *Mar. 9*, 924.

Armagh—Catholic Demonstration by Clovenden Band, Route of, *Mar. 14*, 1385, 1386.

Arnott Estate, Appointment of, For Sale Purposes, Alleged, *Mar. 8*, 727.

Athboy—St. James' mixed National School Residence, Expenditure on, *Mar. 13*, 1196.

Athlone Labourers' Cottages Scheme, Decision as to, *Mar. 9*, 909.

Ballyhaunis Dispensary District Maternity Nurse, *Mar. 3*, 320, 321.

Beet Cultivation, Encouragement of, *Mar. 9*, 932.

Belfast.

Re-valuation principles, *Mar. 7*, 585; *Mar. 13*, 1211.

Water Supply—Rights of Residents in Mourne Catchment Area, *Mar. 7*, 584.

Booth, Sir J. G., Estate of—Refusal of advances to Town Tenants, alleged, *Mar. 6*, 417, 418.

Burrishoole—Negotiations for Sale of Estate of Mr. Jones, *Mar. 6*, 400.

Butter—Delay in Transit and Delay in Dealing with Complaint, *Mar. 14*, 1388.

Cahirciveen River—Erection of Additional Perches, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1384.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*

Castletown Berehaven, Sitting of Sub-Land Commission at, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 7; *Mar. 6*, 414.

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill—Date of Introduction, *Mar. 13*, 1218.

Clare Fair Rent Appeals—Dissatisfaction with Reductions, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 937; *Mar. 13*, 1217, 1218.

Clonmel Court House, Use of, by Club, etc., *Mar. 2*, 195, 196.

Coagh Nationalist Procession, Prohibition of, *Mar. 6*, 419.

Colthurst, Sir G., Sale of Estate of—Turbary rights of Tenants, *Mar. 9*, 931.

Comyn Kenny Estate Grazing Lands, Disposal of, *Mar. 1*, 9; *Mar. 6*, 420.

Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Inspectors, Average Number of Men in the charge of, *Mar. 9*, 909.

McGarry, Constable, Charges against, *Mar. 2*, 191; *Mar. 7*, 565.

Rasharkin, Transfers of Force at, *Mar. 2*, 194.

Reductions effected in, *Mar. 7*, 586; *Mar. 9*, 909; *Mar. 14*, 1389.

Salaries, Information as to, *Mar. 7*, 586.

Sullivan, Sergeant, Case of—Evidence of Handwriting Expert, *Mar. 7*, 582.

County and District Council Elections—Persons qualified to act as Presiding Officers, *Mar. 13*, 1213.

Crofton, Lord, Estate of—Sale of Grazing Land, *Mar. 2*, 192.

De Freyne Estate, Purchase of, *Mar. 2*, 196.

Progress of Negotiations, *Mar. 6*, 421; *Mar. 8*, 727; *Mar. 9*, 935.

Dennehy Estate, Purchase of, *Mar. 8*, 724.

Derrycassan—Case of J. Jordan, *Mar. 9*, 927.

Derrygonelly—Inquiry into Sanitary Condition, *Mar. 13*, 1218.

Derrylaur Electoral Division, Area of, *Mar. 13*, 1176.

Distress in Ireland.

Cause of, and Method of dealing with, *Mar. 14*, 1483, 1484, 1486.

West of Ireland Relief Works, Particulars as to, *Mar. 14*, 1391.

Dopping Hepenstall Estate, Negotiations as to Sale of, *Mar. 9*, 927, 928.

Drainage Schemes, Information as to, *Mar. 2*, 194.

Drumlish, Purchase of, under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1365.

Dublin

Carmen in, Police Proceedings against, for Obstruction, *Mar. 10*, 1047.

[*cont.*

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Dublin—*cont.*
  - Metropolitan Police—Sergeant Booth, Alleged Refusal of, to investigate theft from man named Hannon, *Mar. 9*, 908.
- Education.
  - Dale, Mr., Report of, Observations of Commissioners on, *Mar. 7*, 589.
  - Manual Instructresses qualified to act as Assistant Mistresses—Number employed, Rate of Remuneration, etc., *Mar. 10*, 1053.
  - National School Teachers.
    - Grievances of—Strabane Teachers' Resolution, *Mar. 1*, 22.
    - Pension Fund, Administration of, *Mar. 6*, 402.
    - Pensions, Number of Teachers in Receipt of, Maximum Pension payable, etc., *Mar. 10*, 1053.
    - Promotions of, *Mar. 9*, 910.
    - Rule 127*b*, Effect of, *Mar. 13*, 1176.
    - Salaries, *Mar. 13*, 1194.
  - Rules, New, Date of Issue of, *Mar. 13*, 1177.
  - Schools.
    - Age Regulations for Male Schools *Mar. 7*, 588; *Mar. 13*, 1176.,
    - Model—Disposal of Fees, *Mar. 1*, 27; *Mar. 7*, 564.
  - Technical Instruction, Proposals as to, etc., *Mar. 7*, 563, 588; *Mar. 8*, 722.
  - Training Schools—De La Salla College, Report on, *Mar. 14*, 1388.
- Eviction Reinstatements.
  - Compensation in Land or Money to present Owners who have purchased Evicted Farms, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 195; *Mar. 9*, 975.
  - Information as to, *Mar. 3*, 322; *Mar. 9*, 974.
  - Land Act, 1903, Tabling Regulations under, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 422.
  - Return as to, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 8.
- Fishing Boats, Scheme for Insuring, *Mar. 14*, 1385.
- Galway—Relief Works, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1193.
- Galway, W. T., Estate of—Purchase proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1178.
- Gore-Booth Estate, Sale of—Exclusion of Ballymote, *Mar. 9*, 931; *Mar. 13*, 1213.
- Gun Licence, Refusal of, to J. Murphy, *Mar. 1*, 9.
- Horses—Outbreak of Epizootic Lymphangitis at Waterford—Compensation for Destruction of Horses, *Mar. 13*, 1219.

Atkinson Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Scheme.
  - Progress made with, *Mar. 2*, 187, 188; *Mar. 9*, 930.
  - Roads, Funds for repair of, *Mar. 9*, 930.
- Jevers, Mr. R., Sale of Estate of—Amount offered, etc., *Mar. 9*, 925.
- Jurors Laws, Amendment of, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1389.
- Kenmare—Case of Cottar—Inquiry into Charges against Rev. Mr. Duggan, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 928, 929; *Mar. 14*, 1390, 1391.
- Kerry.
  - County Council Audit, Result of, *Mar. 2*, 190, 191; *Mar. 6*, 400.
  - Evictions and Reinstatements, *Mar. 6*, 414.
  - Fair Rent Appeals, Date of Hearing, *Mar. 1*, 25.
- Kildalkey Constabulary Barracks, Disestablishment of, *Mar. 13*, 1177.
- King-Harman Estate—Exclusion of Portions from Sale, *Mar. 7*, 583, 584; *Mar. 13*, 1213.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Mar. 1*, 120–124.
- Kingston Estate, Particulars as to Sale of, *Mar. 9*, 908.
- Labourers, Improvement in Condition of—Government Pledges, etc., *Mar. 1*, 120–124.
- Labourers Bill, 1904, Terms of, and Reasons for Abandonment of, *Mar. 1*, 121, 122.
- Labourers' Cottages Schemes, Progress made with, *Mar. 1*, 123.
- Land Act, 1903.
  - Estates Commissioners.
    - Administration by, Alteration in Policy, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1212.
    - Advances to Evicted Tenants, Powers as to, *Mar. 9*, 975.
    - Instructions and Regulations Issued to—Tabling, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 976–982.
    - Report of, Date of Presenting *Mar. 7*, 585; *Mar. 9*, 971, 972.
    - Section 5 of the Act, Interpretation and Administration of, *Mar. 9*, 972–974.
    - *Status* of, Administrative Functions, etc., *Mar. 9*, 976–982.
  - Inspectors, Information as to, *Mar. 1* 21.
  - Reinstatements under.
    - Progress made with, *Mar. 7*, 672–680.
    - Tabling Regulations, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 422.

[*cont.*

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Land Act, 1903—*cont.*
Towns and Villages, Purchase of, *Mar. 6,* 418 ; *Mar. 7,* 587, 588.
Transactions under, *Mar. 6,* 401.
Working of, Reports as to, *Mar. 7,* 672–679.
Land Commission.
Fair Rent Appeals.
Courts, Selection of Places for Holding, Studying convenience of Farmers, etc., *Mar. 9,* 969.
Delay in Hearing, *Mar. 9,* 969.
First Term Rents, Action of Commissioners in raising, *Mar. 9,* 969.
Staff of Commissioners, proposed Increase in, Information as to, *Mar 9,* 970.
Work of, Report as to, Date of Issue of, *Mar. 9,* 968.
Land Purchase Advances, Delay in Placing Loans, etc., *Mar. 9,* 970, 971.
Larkhill School Accommodation for Roman Catholic Children, *Mar. 3,* 322.
Law Courts—Evidence of Accused Persons, Law as to, *Mar. 6,* 421.
Limerick.
School, Knitting Instruction at, Report of Miss Anderson, *Mar. 7,* 590.
Technical Classes, Refusal of Pharmaceutical {Society to register, alleged, *Mar. 14,* 1391.
Lisnaskea Petty Sessions—Children sent to Monaghan Female Industrial School, *Mar. 7,* 564.
Local Government Board.
Dispensary Districts, Amalgamation of—Ardee Inquiry Decision, *Mar. 2,* 190.
Officials.
Salaries of, *Mar. 7,* 555.
Terms of Appointment of—Case of T. P. Nolan, *Mar. 1,* 24, 25 ; *Mar. 7,* 582.
Orders, Issue of, in Book Form proposed, *Mar. 2,* 188 ; *Mar. 8,* 727.
Public Bodies Order, 1904, and Union Accounts Order, 1904, Objections to, *Mar. 2,* 188, 189, 191.
Longford.
Constabulary Force, Strength of, *Mar. 14,* 1365.
Land Commission—Fair Rent Appeals, Number of, Date of Hearing, etc., *Mar. 9,* 925 ; *Mar. 13,* 1187.
Longworth Estate, Acreage of, Delay in Disposal of Lands, etc., *Mar. 9,* 929.
Luggacurran Estate—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenant, *Mar. 6,* 416.
Lugnadiffa National School, Information as to, *Mar. 9,* 933.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Magistrates and Justices of the Peace.
Cavan, Appointments in, *Mar. 2,* 193.
Names, etc., of, *Mar. 2,* 174.
Maher Estate, Sale of, Information as to, *Mar. 6,* 416, 417 ; *Mar. 9,* 976.
Maryborough Police Force, Reduction in, proposed, *Mar. 7,* 586.
Mayo.
Marine Works, Progress with, *Mar. 6,* 399 ; *Mar. 13,* 1213.
Relief Works in Distressed Districts, *Mar. 6,* 399.
Melvin, Lough—Memorial as to lowering of Water Level, *Mar. 8,* 725.
Millstreet Land Commission Sittings, Date of, *Mar. 7,* 562.
Monaghan Lunatic Asylum—Case of Nurse Holland, *Mar. 9,* 925.
Morgan, P. S., Purchase of Estate of—Case of J. J. Greene, *Mar. 9,* 934.
Newry—Case of H. J. Livingstone—Execution of Extradition Warrant, etc, *Mar. 1,* 22, 23 ; *Mar. 7,* 581, 582 ; *Mar. 9,* 935, 936 ; *Mar. 13,* 1215, 1216.
Newtown Stewart Labourers' Cottage Scheme, Decision as to, *Mar. 7,* 705.
Newtownforbes, Purchase of, under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, proposed, *Mar. 14,* 1365.
O'Brien Estate, Sale of, *Mar. 2,* 189 ; *Mar. 6,* 423.
Peat Bogs, Experiments as to Utilisation of, *Mar. 7,* 561.
Pettigo Magistracy, Roman Catholic Representation on, *Mar. 8,* 726 ; *Mar. 13,* 1171.
Poor Law.
Officers, Salaries, Promotions and Regulations for Services of, *Mar. 7,* 555, 556.
Reform Committee Report, Date of presenting, *Mar. 2,* 187.
Poulduff Pier reconstruction, Progress made with, *Mar. 7,* 564.
Prisons—Medical Officers, Appointment of, *Mar. 14,* 1387.
Rathclive Grazing Farm, Purchase of, proposed, *Mar. 2,* 193.
Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, 2R. *Mar. 9,* 1016.
Roman Catholic University Question, Government attitude towards, *Mar. 6,* 418.
Sandes, Mr. Collis, Estate of—Terms of Sale, etc., *Mar. 6,* 415.
Segrave Estate grazing lands, Disposal of, *Mar. 13,* 1216.
Skibbereen—Dr. Jennings, Land Commission Valuation of Farm of, *Mar. 14,* 1386.

[*cont.*

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Sligo.
  - Distress in—Result of Local Government Board Investigations, *Mar. 8*, 724.
  - Public Works, Funds available for, *Mar. 8*, 725; *Mar. 13*, 1214.
- Springtown—Reinstatement of T. Reilly, *Mar. 8*, 722.
- Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Sale of, *Mar. 2*, 193.
- Thompson-Orpen Estate Evictions, Disturbances at, Action of Constabulary, etc., *Mar. 7*, 580.
- Tipperary Court House, use of, for Social Amusements, *Mar. 7*, 589.
- Tonnemore Grazing Farm, Purchase of, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 587.
- Traction Engines, Damage done to Roads by—Application of Highways and Locomotives Act to Ireland, *Mar. 8*, 723.
- Trinity College Tenants, Committee Report as to, *Mar. 1*, 26.
- Tuberkeen—Reinstatement of Mr. G. Ward, *Mar. 14*, 1387.
- United Irish League—Outrage at Dingle, alleged, *Mar. 1*, 24.
- Urban District Council Special Meetings, Provision for summoning, *Mar. 2*, 174.
- Watergrasshill Prosecution Case, *Mar. 1*, 20.
- Wexford Evictions and Reinstatements, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1187.
- White Estate, Bantry—Person employed to inquire into cases of Evicted Tenants, *Mar. 1*, 26.
- Woodville—Investigation of alleged outrage at house of Mr. Persse, *Mar. 9*, 933, 934; *Mar 13*, 1217.

Attorney-General
- *Sir R. B. Finlay*

Attorney-General for Ireland.
- *Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson*

Aughnacashel
- Telegraph Office, Establishment of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. McHugh; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 728, 729.

Australia
- Sugar Bounties, Abolition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 1*, 12.
- Western Australia, *see that title.*

Austria-Hungary
- Trade Report Presented, *Mar. 13*, 1130.

Avebury, Lord
- Prevention of Corruption Bill, 2R., *Mar. 13*, 1165.
- Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 14*, 1334–1340, 1355.

Aylesbury Gas Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 389.

Backworth
- Electric Railway, Fatality on—Protection of live rails, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 1*, 15.

Bahr-el-Ghazal
- *See under* Soudan.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Mar. 7*, 553.

Balcarres, Lord—*Lord of the Treasury* [Lancashire, Chorley]
- Berwick-on-Tweed Walls, Preservation of, *Mar. 9*, 924.
- House of Commons.
  - Division Lobbies—Provision of extra exits, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1380.
  - Ladies Gallery, Ventilation of, *Mar. 14*, 1381.
- Mall to Charing Cross—Victoria Memorial.
  - Pillars, Position of, *Mar. 2*, 186.
  - Progress made with, *Mar. 14*, 1380.
- Rotten Row, Repair of, *Mar. 13*, 1172.
- Unemployed, Suggestion as to Work for, *Mar. 1*, 7.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, E.]
- Africa, South.
  - High Commissioner.
    - Milner, Lord—Resignation, *Mar. 1*, 29.
      - Reasons for retirement of, *Mar. 6*, 500.
    - Powers of, *Mar. 9*, 945.
    - Selborne, Lord, Appointment of, *Mar. 2*, 202; *Mar. 6*, 495–502.
      - Qualifications, Salary and Conditions of Appointment, *Mar. 6*, 428, 429.
- Aliens Bill—Date of introduction, *Mar. 6*, 425.
- Army Estimates, Facilities for discussion of, *Mar. 14*, 1509.
- Business of the House.
  - Course of, *Mar. 2*, 202, 203; *Mar. 6*, 430, 431; *Mar. 7*, 596; *Mar. 9*, 945, 946; *Mar. 13*, 1229.
  - Motion to report progress, *Mar. 2*, 271, 273.
- Chief Secretary for Ireland, Date of appointing, *Mar. 9*, 942.
- Commerce, Ministry of—Date of introduction of Bill, *Mar. 8*, 733.
- Congested Districts Board, Scotland—Augmentation of Funds, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 426.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
- Criminal Appeal, Court of—Establishment proposed, *Mar. 8*, 731.
- Criminal Law, Administration of—Commission of inquiry into convictions of innocent persons, proposed, *Mar. 8*, 730, 731.
- Defence of the Empire.
  - Home Defence, Force necessary for—Decision of Defence Committee *Mar. 7*, 595.
  - Invasion or Raid, Preparedness for, *Mar. 14*, 1393, 1394.
- Education.
  - Secondary School Fees and Free Places, Representations as to, *Mar. 13*, 1228.
  - Underfed Children, Free Meals for, *Mar. 8*, 732, 733.
- Education, Scotland—Training of Teachers—Opportunity for Discussion of Minutes, *Mar. 7*, 594.
- Fiscal Policy.
  - Colonial Conference, Subjects to be Discussed at, *Mar. 13*, 1227, 1228.
  - Colonies, Preferential Treatment for—Food Taxation, etc., *Mar. 8*, 839–844.
  - General Election—Mandate to be asked of the Country, *Mar. 7*, 594.
- Foreign Trawlers Regulation Bill, Date of Taking, *Mar. 13*, 1223, 1224.
- India, Affairs of, Opportunity for Discussion of, *Mar. 7*, 595, 596.
- Ireland.
  - Chief Secretary.
    - Method of Appointing, Tenure of Office, etc., *Mar. 2*, 200.
    - Wyndham, Mr., Resignation of, *Mar. 6*, 431.
  - MacDonnell, Sir A.
    - Censure of, by the Cabinet.
      - Correspondence with Chief Secretary, Cognisance of, by Members of Cabinet, *Mar. 13*, 1224.
      - Explanation of Action, opportunity Afforded for, *Mar. 6*, 426.
    - Conditions of Acceptance of Office, *Mar. 9*, 942, 1224–1227.
      - Communication of, by Prime Minister to his Colleagues, *Mar. 9*, 943, 944.
- Land Values, Taxation of, in London, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 566.
- Ministers of the Crown, Company Directorships held by, *Mar. 6*, 429.
- Navy Estimates.
  - Date of Taking, *Mar. 8*, 734.
  - Discussion on, *Mar. 13*, 1229.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
- Parliamentary Procedure.
  - Previous Question used in Connection with a Motion made by Private Member, *Mar. 8*, 842.
  - Private Member securing Place by Ballot for a Motion on going into Supply, Precedence of, over Minister, *Mar. 2*, 203; *Mar. 6*, 430.
- Physical Deterioration Committee, Adoption of Report and Recommendations of, proposed, *Mar. 8*, 732, 733.
- Public Accounts Committee Report, Date of Discussing, *Mar. 13*, 1230.
- Scotland—Crofters Act, Legislation to Extend to Buteshire, proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1223, 1224.
- Scottish Church Property Dispute—Recommendations of Commissioners disregarded by Free Church Representatives, *Mar. 14*, 1394.
- South African War—Stores and Supplies, Report of Comptroller on Wastage of—Date of Discussing, *Mar. 13*, 1229.
- Supply, Application of Closure to Business of, *Mar. 14*, 1395–1397, 1503–1505, 1509.
- Trade, Board of—Appointment of Lord Salisbury as President, *Mar. 13*, 1292–1300.
- Trade Disputes, Royal Commission on—Date of Presenting Report, *Mar. 2*, 201.
- Transvaal Representative Institutions.
  - Discussion, Opportunity for, *Mar. 8*, 710.
  - Powers of Lord Selborne as to, *Mar. 6*, 498, 499.
- Trawlers' Certificates Suspension Bill, Date of Taking, *Mar. 13*, 1223, 1224.
- Turkey—Debt Decree of September, 1903, Information as to, *Mar. 6*, 427, 428.
- Unemployed, Legislation for, Date of Introduction of, *Mar. 6*, 430.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Leeds, Central]
- Africa, South—Freight Charges on Boots and Shoes, *Mar. 8*, 717.
- "Albert" Wreck, Removal of, *Mar. 13*, 1189.
- Bread, Comparative Prices of, 1902–1905, *Mar. 8*, 718.
- Coastguards—Sanday, Island of—Establishment of Station, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 165.
- Companies.
  - Dentist, Registration of—Case of Attorney-General *v.* Appleton, *Mar. 13*, 1189.
  - Sale of Poisons by, *Mar. 13*, 1188.
- Dublin—Joint Stock Companies, Information as to, *Mar. 2*, 199.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
- Gambling in Futures.
  - Foreign Countries, Working of Legislative Measures in, against, *Mar. 9,* 913.
  - Government Proposals, *Mar. 7,* 557.
- Germany—New Commercial Treaties, Provisions of—Preparation of Statement, *Mar. 6,* 411.
- Holyhead Fishermen, Disaster to—Assistance to families, *Mar. 8,* 717.
- Labour Statistics, Annual Abstract of, *Mar. 9,* 922.
- Merchant Shipping.
  - Foreign Ships—Application of Statutory Powers—Re-appointment of Select Committee, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 410.
  - Tonnage Measurement, Committee on—Terms of Reference, *Mar. 7,* 557.
- Metric System, Adoption of, proposed, *Mar. 1,* 5.
- Nurses, Society for the Higher Education of, Grant of licence for, *Mar. 13,* 1202.
- Poisons, Sale of—Regulations as to Sale by Companies, *Mar. 13,* 1188.
- Railways.
  - Derailments of Tender-Engines drawing Passenger Trains, Return as to, proposed, *Mar. 10,* 1050.
  - Electric.
    - Accidents through Contact with the rail, Number and Prevention of, *Mar. 7,* 573, 574.
    - Backworth, Fatality at, *Mar. 1,* 15.
    - District Railway, Electrification of—Provision as to Driver's Assistant, *Mar. 9,* 907; *Mar. 10,* 1049.
  - Servants' Hours of Labour, Reduction of, *Mar. 2,* 170.
- Statistical Abstract of British Empire, Omissions from, *Mar. 7,* 557.
- Sugar.
  - Brussels Convention.
    - Appeals, Date of Hearing, etc., *Mar. 6,* 410.
    - Freights on German Railways—Reduction of Rates, *Mar. 13,* 1201.
  - Russo-German Treaty, Provisions of, *Mar. 13,* 1201.
- Wheat and Flour, Registration fee, Receipts from, on Imports, 1903, *Mar. 8,* 718.
- Wheat Imports in 1903 and 1904, *Mar. 8,* 718.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
- Advertisements Regulation Bill, 2R., *Mar. 9,* 865–871, 874.

Ballyhaunis
- Dispensary District, Maternity Nurse for.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 3,* 320, 321.

Ballylinch
- Signal Station, Date of Erection of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 7,* 554.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]
- Army—Deferred Pay, Amount of, *Mar. 2,* 259.
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3,* 356, 372.
- Main Question not Claimed until after Question put from the Chair—Rule as to Moving Closure, *Mar. 10,* 1126.
- Minister of the Crown acting as Chairman, Precedents for, *Mar. 2,* 261.
- Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3,* 346.

Bankruptcy
- Ireland—Returns presented, *Mar. 2,* 164; *Mar. 3,* 298.
- Undischarged Bankrupts Promoting Companies, Legislation to prevent, proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Markham; *As.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 8,* 719.

Barbados
- Prisoners, Juvenile Adult, Rules for, Presented, *Mar. 2,* 164; *Mar. 8,* 862.

"Barham," H.M.S.
- Speed and Fishery Duties of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 404.

Barlinnie Prison
- Visiting Committee, Rules as to, Presented, *Mar. 2,* 151.

Barlow, Mr. J. E. [Somerset, Frome]
- Bath, Telegraph Service at—Grievances of Female Telegraphists, *Mar. 7,* 574,

Barry, Mr. E. [Cork Co., S.]
- Skibbereen—Land Commission Valuation of Farm of Dr. Jennings, *Mar. 14,* 1386.

Barrymore Estate Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Mar. 7,* 529.

Bartley, Sir G. C. T. [Islington, N.]
- Girls' Public Day School Company, Profits of, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1208.

Bath
Telegraph Service at—Grievances of Female Telegraphists.
Q. Mr. Barlow; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar.* *7*, 574.

Bath, Marquess of—*Under Secretary for India.*
Colonial and Indian Forest Service Departments, Transfer of, from Cooper's Hill to Oxford University, *Mar.* *7*, 538–544.
Import Duties, *Mar.* *13*, 1140–1146.

Belfast
Post Office.
Mail Service Facilities with London, Improvement of.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Lord Stanley *Mar.* *13*, 1219, 1220.
Staff, Pay of.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar.* *2*, 167.
Valuation Appeals—Principle of Valuation, Objection to.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *7*, 585.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. Clancy; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar.* *13*, 1210, 1211.
Victoria Barracks—Closing of Trainfield Gate.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar.* *13*, 1179, 1180.
Water Supply—Mourne Catchment area, Rights of Residents in.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *7*, 584.

Belgium
Trade Report Presented, *Mar.* *6*, 386.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R., *Mar.* *3*, 373.
Railway Servants—Reduction of Work Hours, *Mar.* *2*, 170.
Trade, Board of—Appointment of Lord Salisbury as President, *Mar.* *13*, 1306.
Trade Disputes, Royal Commission on—Date of Presenting Report, *Mar.* *2*, 200.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Disturbances, Method of dealing with, *Mar.* *6*, 392,

Bellew, Lord
Representative Peer for Ireland, Elected as, *Mar.* *13*, 1129.

Belper, Lord
Advertisements Regulation Bill, 2R., *Mar.* *9*, 873.
Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill. 2R., *Mar.* *14*, 1348, 1355.

Belturbet
Postal Facilities, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar.* *13*, 1219.
Sunday Post to Milltown, Establishment of, proposed.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar.* *9*, 911, 912.

Benn, Mr. J. W. [Devonport]
Navy Dockyards.
Distribution of Work between Government and Private Yards, *Mar.* *13*, 1270, 1271.
Grievances, Opportunity for Communicating, to Superior Officials, *Mar.* *13*, 1271, 1272.
Repairs, Comparative cost of, in Private and Government Dockyards, *Mar.* *13*, 1270, 1271.

Bermuda
Naval Works at, Expenditure on.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar.* *6*, 489.

Berwick-on-Tweed
Walls, Preservation of.
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Mar.* *9*, 924.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. M. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
Post Office—Risk Allowance at Ludgate Hill, *Mar.* *6*, 397.

Bigwood, Mr. J. [Middlesex, Brentford]
City of London (Escape from Fire) Bill, 2R., *Mar.* *14*, 1461.

Bill, Mr. C. [Staffordshire, Leek]
Gibraltar Dock Works, East Side—Report of Admiral Rawson, *Mar.* *14*, 1364.

Bishopric of Bristol Bill
l. Com. and *Rep.** *Mar.* *7*, 532.
3R. *Mar.* *9*, 889.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Banffshire]
Education, Scotland—Training of Teachers, Opportunity of Discussing Minute on, *Mar.* *7*, 594.
Fiscal Policy—Mandate to be asked of the Country, *Mar.* *7*, 593, 594.
Foreign Trawlers Regulation Bill, Date of Taking, *Mar.* *13*, 1223.
Navy.
Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar.* *14*, 1404.
Policy, Changes in, *Mar.* *14*, 1403, 1404.
Rosyth Dockyard Works, Progress made with, *Mar.* *14*, 1423.
Tonnage Measurement, Committee on—Terms of Reference, *Mar.* *7*, 557,

Blackpool and Garstang Light Railway Order, 1901 (Blackpool and Fylde Light Railway) (Change of Name, &c.)
- Presented, *Mar. 8*, 698; *Mar. 9*, 861.

Blackpool, St. Anne's and Lytham Tramways Bill
- *l.* Not to be further Proceeded with, *Mar. 9*, 857.

Blake, Mr. E. [Longford, S.]
- MacDonnell, Sir A., Conditions of Acceptance of Office by, etc., *Mar. 9*, 944.

Boland, Mr. J. [Kerry, S.]
- Cahirciveen River—Erection of Additional Perches, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1384.
- Dennehy Estate, Purchase of, *Mar. 8*, 723.
- Fishing Boats, Scheme for Insuring, *Mar. 14*, 1384.
- Irish Language.
  - Letters and Parcels addressed in.
    - Delay of, *Mar. 6*, 423; *Mar. 7*, 590, 591.
    - Error in Address of Letter to Kilronan, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 939; *Mar. 13*, 1220.
    - Post Office Regulations as to, *Mar. 8*, 729, 730.
  - Teaching in Schools, *Mar. 7*, 578.
- Kenmare—Case of Cottar—Inquiry into Charges against Rev. Mr. Duggan, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 928; *Mar. 14*, 1390, 1391.
- Nymphsfield—Decision as to St. Joseph's Catholic School, *Mar. 8*, 720; *Mar. 14*, 1379.

Booth, Sir J. G., Estate of
- Town Tenants, Refusal of Advance to, alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 417.

Bowles, Mr. T. G. [Lynn Regis]
- Admiralty—First Sea Lord, Changes in Office of, *Mar. 7*, 609, 610, 611.
- Army.
  - Period of Service, Reasons for Limitation of, to Twelve Years, *Mar. 7*, 638.
  - Reserve, Estimate for, *Mar. 7*, 638.
- Army Estimates, Supplementary, Objections to System of, *Mar. 2*, 240.
- Cuba and United States, Reciprocity Treaty between—Effect on British Trade, *Mar. 1*, 13, 14.
- Estimates.
  - Opportunity for Discussion, *Mar. 2*, 203.

Bowles, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*
- Estimates—*cont.*
  - Supplementary, Objections to System of, *Mar. 1*, 68, 69; *Mar. 2*, 240.
- Income Tax Returns, Privacy of, *Mar. 13*, 1174.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Mar. 1*, 59–74.
- Navy.
  - Atlantic Fleet, Repairing of, at Gibraltar, *Mar. 7*, 615.
  - Bases, Policy as to, *Mar. 7*, 613-616.
  - "Enchantress" Yacht, Cost of, *Mar. 2*, 175, 176. *Mar. 7*, 705, 706.
  - Flogging of Boys in, *Mar 7*, 607, 608.
  - Gunnery.
    - Inspector of Target Practice for the Fleet, Duties and Emoluments of, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1260.
    - Responsibility of Officers for, *Mar. 7*, 610.
  - Obsolete Ships.
    - Effective and Non-effective List, Number, Age, Cost, etc., of Vessels struck off, *Mar. 13*, 1234, 1325.
    - Elimination of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 7*, 613.
  - Personnel, Shortage in, *Mar. 6*, 611, 612.
  - Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 1*, 65; *Mar. 7*, 608–611.
  - Reserve—Respective claims of Naval Reserve and Volunteer Reserve, *Mar. 7*, 611.
- Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill, *Com.*, *Mar. 9*, 901; *Mar. 13*, 1169.
- Parliamentary Procedure.
  - Member called upon by the Speaker to move the Order of the Day—Motion "that he be not heard," *Mar. 6*, 434.
  - Private Member securing Place by Ballot for a Motion on going into Supply, Precedence of, over Minister, *Mar. 2*, 203, 204; *Mar. 6*, 433, 435.
- Post Office—Addresses in German, Regulation as to, *Mar. 6*, 425.
- Post Office Savings Bank.
  - Deficiency in Income Account of—Measures proposed to render Bank self-supporting, *Mar. 7*, 572.
  - Depositors' Accounts, Inspection of, power of Registrar of Friendly Societies, etc., *Mar. 8*, 715; *Mar. 13*, 1205.
- Public Accounts—Date of discussing Committee Report, *Mar. 13*, 1229.

[*cont.*

March 1—March 14.

Bowles, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*
  Revenue and Expenditure.
    Accounts, System of keeping, and presenting to the House, *Mar*, *1*, 61–65.
    Financial Position of the Country, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1*, 59–74.
  Rotten Row, Repair of, *Mar. 13*, 1172.
  Selborne, Earl of—Conditions of Appointment as High Commissioner of South Africa, *Mar. 6*, 428, 429.
  Somaliland Expedition, Cost of, *Mar. 8*, 746.
    Estimate for, *Mar. 2*, 226.
    Total Cost, *Mar. 2*, 180.
  Sugar—Colonial Bounties, Abolition of—*Mar. 1*, 12.
  Transvaal War Contribution, Date of payment of, etc., *Mar. 1*, 70–73.
  Turkey—Debt Decree of Sept. 1, 1903, Information as to, *Mar. 6*, 427, 428.
  Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Case of Mr. P. Cook, *Mar. 8*, 716.

Bread
  Prices, Comparative, of, 1902–1905.
    Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 8*, 718.

Brentwood Gas Bill
  c. 2R.* *Mar. 13*, 1168.

Bridgwater Canals Bill
  l. 2R.* *Mar. 3*, 297.

Brigg, Mr. J. [York, W. R., Keighley]
  Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill. 2R., *Mar. 3*, 373.

Bright, Mr. A. H. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
  London, Defence of—Expenditure on Earthworks on Surrey Hills, *Mar. 14*, 1368.
  Navy.
    Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 14*, 1429, 1430.
    Obsolete Vessels, *Mar. 14*, 1429, 1430.
  Postmen, Rural, Wages of, *Mar. 9*, 923.

Bristol
  Telegraph Superintendentship, Appointment to.
    Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 910, 911.

Bristol, Bishop of
  Bishopric of Bristol Bill, 3R. *Mar. 9*, 889.
  Education—Supply of Teachers, *Mar. 9*, 894.
  Indian and Colonial Forest Services Departments, transfer of, from Cooper's Hill to University of Oxford, *Mar. 7*, 549.

Bristol Blind Asylum Bill
  l. 2R.* *Mar. 14*, 1333.

Bristol Corporation Bill
  c. 2R.* *Mar. 7*, 553.

British Empire
  Statistical Abstract, Omissions from.
    Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 7*, 557.

British Museum
  Account, Return of Visitors and Statement as to Progress made in arranging Exhibits, etc., Ordered, *Mar. 7*, 553.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
  Navy, Flogging in, *Mar. 14*, 1438–1441.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John—*Secretary of State for India* [Surrey, Guildford]
  Army—Increase of Expenditure, *Mar. 2*, 173.
  Bombay—University Provisional Syndicate, Rules for Election of, *Mar. 9*, 914, 915.
  Budget
    Date of Presenting, *Mar. 2*, 171.
    Military Services, Increase of Expenditure under, *Mar. 2*, 173.
  Crops, Damage to, by Frost—Provision against distress, etc., *Mar. 1*, 8.
  Expenditure, Reason for Increase in, *Mar. 9*, 919.
  Imperator *v.* A. C. Rolt, Case of—Presentation of Report proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1192.
  Petitions for Redress of Grievances Presented in Parliament, Action taken on, *Mar. 9*, 914.
  Police, Commission on—Adoption of Report and Recommendations, *Mar. 6*, 407.
  Tibet Expedition.
    Rewards for Services—Omission of Transport Officers, alleged, *Mar. 9*, 916.
    Treaty.
      Chinese Plenipotentiary, Appointment of, *Mar. 6*, 407; *Mar. 7*, 570.
      Indemnity, Amount of—Period allowed for Payment, *Mar. 7*, 570.

Brompton, Chatham, Gillingham, and Rochester Water Bill
  c. 2R.* *Mar. 1*, 1.

Broughton Gifford
  School, Building grant to, in 1870.
    Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 3*, 318.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
- Africa, South—Powers of High Commissioner, *Mar. 9*, 945.
- Army Estimates, Date of taking, *Mar. 13*, 1229.
- Berwick-on-Tweed Walls, Preservation of, *Mar. 9*, 924.
- Business of the House, Course of, *Mar. 9*, 945.
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 369.
- Fiscal Policy—Colonial Conference, Subjects to be discussed at, *Mar. 13*, 1227.
- Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 346.
- Somaliland Expedition, Conduct and Cost of, *Mar. 8*, 774–778.
- Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14*, 1395–1397, 1504.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R. [Perthshire, E.]
- Africa, South—Railways taken over by the Military, Payment for, *Mar.* 1, 3.
- Army.
  - Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 1*, 41.
  - Foreign Service, Number and Cost of Troops serving on, *Mar. 1*, 38, 39.
- Army Estimates, Date of Tabling, *Mar. 7*, 568.
- Bermuda, Naval Works at, Expenditure on, *Mar. 6*, 489.
- Colonial Appropriations-in-Aid, Information as to, *Mar. 2*, 219.
- Financial Position of the Country, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1*, 30–42.
- Navy.
  - Bases, Foreign and Colonial, Expenditure on, *Mar. 6*, 488; *Mar. 13*, 1318, 1319.
  - Battleships—King Edward VII. Type, Cost of, Number Constructed, etc., *Mar. 6*, 485, 486.
  - Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 13*, 1315.
  - Dockyards — Chatham Extension Works, Progress made with, Policy as to, etc., *Mar. 6*, 489.
  - Expenditure, Reduction in, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 487.
  - Obsolete Ships.
    - Classification of, *Mar. 13*, 1199, 1200.
    - Effective and Non-effective List, Number, Age, Cost, etc., of Vessels Struck off, *Mar. 6*, 490; *Mar. 13*, 1315–1317.
    - Elimination of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 13*, 1315.
  - *Personnel*, Reduction in, *Mar. 13*, 1320.
  - Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 1*, 40; *Mar. 6*, 486–491; *Mar. 13*, 1313, 1314.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*cont.*
- Navy—*cont.*
  - Repairs.
    - Cost of.
      - Comparative, in Private and Government Dockyards, *Mar. 6*, 487, 488.
      - Gibraltar and Malta, at, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1320.
    - Ships to be struck off Effective List, Estimate for Repairs to, *Mar. 13*, 1317.
  - Reserve Squadron, Constitution of, *Mar. 6*, 491.
  - Rosyth Base, Dockyard Works at, Progress made with, etc., *Mar. 6*, 489, 517.
  - Scouts—Cost, Purposes and Success of, Information as to, *Mar. 6*, 488.
  - Shipbuilding, Acceleration in rate of, Advantages of, etc., *Mar. 6*, 487.
  - Stations at Halifax and Esquimault handed over to the Canadian Government, Policy of, *Mar. 6*, 489; *Mar. 13*, 1318.
  - Wei-Hai-Wei, Naval Works at, Abandonment of, *Mar. 6*, 490, 517.
  - Works.
    - Acts, Expenditure under, *Mar. 6* 404.
      - Details of, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1318, 1319.
      - Estimated, for Current Year, *Mar. 6*, 490, 517.
    - Bill—Date of Introduction, *Mar.6*, 404.
    - Loan Expenditure on, *Mar. 13*, 1172.
    - Vote for, Increase in, *Mar. 6*, 489, 490.
- Parliamentary Procedure—Private Member Securing Place by Ballot for a Motion on going into Supply, Procedence of, over Minister, *Mar. 2*, 204.
- Somaliland Expedition, Total Cost of, *Mar. 2*, 180.
- South African War, Cost of, Increase in Supplementary Estimates Due to, etc., *Mar. 2*, 219.
- Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14*, 1396.

Budget
- Date of Bringing in.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 8*, 714.
- Deficits, Method of Meeting.
  - *Q.* Mr. M'Crae; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 8*, 714.
- Supplementary Budgets, Objections to System of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1*, 35.

Burns, Mr. J. [Battersea]
City of London (Escape from Fire) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 14,* 1461.
London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 14,* 1462.
Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 382.
Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 344.
Somaliland Expedition, Conduct of, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 8,* 763–768.

Burrishoole
Jones, Mr., Estate of—Progress of Negotiations as to sale.
Q. Dr Ambrose; *A* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6,* 400.

Business of the House
Course of.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Lough, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 2,* 202–205.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. E. Robertson, Sir A. Rollit, Mr. S. Buxton, *Mar. 6,* 430, 431.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 7,* 596.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 8,* 734; Sir A. Acland-Hood, Mr. Lough, Mr. Whitley, 855, 856.
Os. Mr. Bryce, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Lough, Mr. Pretyman, Mr. C. Hobhouse, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Major Seely, Mr. W. Churchill, *Mar. 9,* 945, 946.
Os. Mr. Bryce, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1229; Sir A. Acland-Hood, Mr. Whitley, Mr. W. Churchill, 1332.
Exempted business carried over one o'clock a.m.—Standing Order as to other business.
Os. Mr. Runciman, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 1,* 147, 148.
Motion to report Progress [Mr. Lloyd-George] *Mar. 2,* 271.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 2,* 271, 273,; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 275; Mr. M'Kenna, 276–278
Prime Minister, Absence of, from Debates.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 2,* 270; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 272, 274; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 274, 275; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 276; Mr. S. MacNeill, *Mar. 9,* 1040.
Unopposed Returns, Objections to after midnight.
Os. Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 9,* 1038 1039; Mr. Lough, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Whitley, 1038.

Buteshire
Parliamentary Election—New Member Sworn, *Mar. 8,* 734.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
Africa, South.
Railways taken over by the Military, Payment for, *Mar. 1,* 17.
Selborne, Earl of, Appointment of, as High Commissioner, *Mar. 6* 502–505.
Army Estimates, Date of taking, *Mar. 6,* 431.
Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 339–341.
Somaliland, Grants in Aid for, Information as to, *Mar. 1,* 3.
Somaliland Expedition.
Expenditure on, Information as to *Mar. 1,* 9.
Treaty obligations with Native Tribes, etc., *Mar. 8,* 782–785.

Cabinet
Meetings—Attendance of Minister prior to taking office and being sworn of the Privy Council, Constitutional Practice as to.
Os. Earl Spencer, *Mar. 9,* 863; Marquess of Lansdowne, Marquess of Ripon, 864; Earl of Halsbury, 865.

"Cadmus," H.M.S.
Construction—Date of Laying down, of Completion, Cost, Removal from active List.
Qs. Mr. Soares,; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 402, 403.

Cahirciveen River
Perches, Additional, Erection of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14,* 1384.

Caithness
Fishing Industry, Inquiry into depression of—Date of Report.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 2,* 165.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanark, Mid.]
Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill, *Com., Mar. 9,* 901.

Caledonian Railway Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 7,* 553.

Campbell, Mr. J. H. M.—*Solicitor-General for Ireland* [Dublin University]
Distress in Ireland, Cause of, and Method of dealing with, *Mar. 14,* 1492, 1494.

Campbell, Mr. John [Armagh, S.]
Armagh Post Office—Case of Mr. R. J M'Cusker, *Mar. 6,* 397.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
Business of the House.
Course of, *Mar. 2,* 202; *Mar. 6,* 430; *Mar. 7,* 596.

[cont.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*
Business of the House—*cont.*
Prime Minister, Absence of, from Debates—Motion to report Progress, etc., *Mar. 2,* 274, 275.
Financial Position of the Country, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1,* 91–94.

Camperdown, Earl of
Advertisements Regulation Bill, 2R. *Mar. 9,* 871–873.

Canada
British Garrisons in, Withdrawal of, from Halifax and Esquimault, Information as to.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6,* 489; Mr. C. Wason, 520; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7,* 614, 615, 616; Gen. Laurie, Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13,* 1258; Mr. Buchanan, 1318; Gen. Laurie, *Mar. 14,* 1402, 1403; Mr. Pretyman, 1416, 1417.
Qs. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 14,* 1373.
Correspondence—Tabling, proposed.
Q. Mr. Rea; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 2,* 182.
Sugar Bounties, Abolition of.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 1,* 12.
Whiskey—Practice as to Age Guarantee.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 6,* 408.

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Prevention of Corruption Bill, 2R. *Mar. 13,* 1166.
Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 14,* 1340–1348.

Cape Colony
Customs Duties—Claim for Rebate on Articles purchased during the War.
Qs. Mr. Whitley; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 176.

Carrick-on-Shannon
Postmastership, Appointment to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9,* 939, 940.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H.—*Solicitor-General* [Dublin University]
Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney General, for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9,* 1028, 1031.

Castletown, Berehaven
Land Commission sitting at, proposed.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 7; *Mar. 6,* 413, 414.

Cattle
Metropolitan Cattle Market—Accounts Presented, *Mar. 10,* 1041, 1046.

Causton, Mr. R. K. [Southwark, W.]
Customs Watchers, Duties and Remuneration of, *Mar. 6,* 397.

Cavan
Magistrates, Appointment of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 192, 193.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*Financial Secretary of the Treasury* [Derbyshire, W.]
"Albert" wreck, Removal of, *Mar. 6,* 396.
Civil Service.
Abstractor Clerks.
Memorial from, Decision as to, *Mar. 2,* 184, 185.
Promotion Regulations, *Mar. 6,* 396.
Grievances of Officials, Rule as to Members of Parliament calling Attention to, *Mar. 2,* 167.
Customs and Excise.
Promotion, Compensation for Retardation of, *Mar. 13,* 1192
Watchers, Duties and Remuneration of, *Mar. 6,* 397.
Education, Ireland.
Model School Fees, Disposal of, *Mar. 7,* 558.
National School Teachers.
Pension Fund.
Abstract, Printing of, *Mar. 7,* 593.
Administration of, *Mar. 2,* 199; *Mar. 7,* 593.
Investigation into, Date of, *Mar. 12,* 1222.
Pensions, Amount of, *Mar. 2,* 175.
Promotion—New Rules for Pension Establishment, *Mar. 7,* 593.
Schools—Drumglass School Plans, *Mar 1,* 29.
Galleries, Tate and National, Lighting of, *Mar. 3,* 318.
Ireland.
Dublin.
Phœnix Park Footpaths, Use of, by Cyclists, *Mar. 2,* 199.
Viceregal Lodge, Painting work at, *Mar. 2,* 198.
Franciscan Manuscripts, Progress made with printing, *Mar. 6,* 395.
Galway.
Harbour, Dredging of, *Mar. 9,* 938, *Mar. 13,* 1223.
Mill Stream, Clearing—Expenditure by Board of Works, *Mar. 14,* 1392.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
St. Mel's Cathedral, Preservation of, *Mar. 13,* 1192.
Land Act, 1903—Estates Commissioners' Report, form of, *Mar. 13,* 1222.
North Sea—British Trawlers fired on by Baltic Fleet—Result of Inquiry, *Mar. 1,* 18.
Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill, *com., Mar. 10,* 1046; *Mar. 13,* 1169.
Old Age Pensions—Scheme of Mr. Cottew, *Mar. 2,* 169.
Spirits, Foreign Duty Paid—Removals in United Kingdom, Check on Statement by Spirit Dealers, etc., *Mar. 2,* 185.
War Office Abstractor Clerks, Retirement Regulations for, *Mar. 6,* 396.
Workmen's Compensation Act—Government employees, Scheme Accepted by, *Mar. 9,* 905.
Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Costs to be defrayed by the Treasury—Supplementary Estimate for, *Mar. 9,* 1032, 1033, 1036.

Cawley, Mr. F. [Lancs., Prestwich]
Africa, South—Appointment of Earl of Selborne as High Commissioner, *Mar. 6,* 511.
Motors—Offences against the law, Identification of Motorists, etc., *Mar. 2,* 169.

Central Electric Supply Bill
l. 2R*., *Mar. 2,* 149.

Ceylon
Education of Children on Tea Estates.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 7,* 569, 570.

Chairman
Army Estimates.
Irrelevant Subjects, Introduction of, *Mar. 2,* 211, 232, 233, 239, 252, 265, 266.
Reserve, Vote for, Motion for Reduction of, *Mar. 7,* 642.
Deputy, *see that title.*
Irrelevant Observations, *Mar. 7,* 640; *Mar. 9,* 952, 1029, 1031.
Minister of the Crown Acting as Chairman during Temporary Absence of Chairman, Precedents for.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Pretyman, Sir F. Banbury, Mr. MacVeagh, *Mar. 2,* 261; Mr. J. F. Hope, Mr. Chairman, 262.
Navy Estimates—General question not to be discussed on a Particular Vote, *Mar. 14,* 1438.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, W.]
Africa, South—Appointment of Lord Selborne as High Commissioner, *Mar. 6,* 505–510.
Fiscal Policy—Preferential Treatment for Colonies, Food Taxation, etc., *Mar. 8,* 827, 830–839.
Parliamentary Procedure—Previous questions used in Connection with a Motion made by Private Members, *Mar. 8,* 833.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Worcestershire, E.]
Accounts, Revision of Existing System of, proposed, *Mar. 1,* 84, 85.
Africa, South—Railways taken over by the Military, Payments for, *Mar. 1,* 16, 17.
Budget.
Date of bringing in, *Mar. 8,* 714.
Deficits, Method of Meeting, *Mar. 8,* 714.
Estate Duty—Authority of officials to Interpret Section 21 (1) of Statute, *Mar. 10,* 1052.
Financial Position of the Country, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1,* 79–91.
Fiscal Policy—Preferential Treatment for Colonies, Food Taxation, etc., *Mar. 8,* 828.
Income Tax Returns, Privacy of, *Mar. 13,* 1175.
Inland Revenue—Clerks in Collectors' offices, Pay for Extra Duty, *Mar. 7,* 573.
Land Act (Ireland) 1903—Issue of Stock, Loss on Repayment at Par., *Mar. 1,* 16.
National Debt.
Commissioners, Information as to, *Mar. 7,* 571.
Reduction of—Powers of Commissioners as to preparation of Savings Banks Balance Sheets, etc., *Mar. 7,* 571; *Mar. 14,* 1377.
Naval Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 1,* 87.
Public Buildings (Expenses) Act 1898 Fund, Sale of Consols under, *Mar. 6.* 409.
Revenue and Expenditure—Method of meeting Deficits, *Mar. 8,* 714.
Savings Bank, Post Office.
Balance Sheet—Powers of Commissioners for Reduction of National Debt, etc., *Mar. 7,* 571; *Mar. 14,* 1377.
Consols purchased by (1894–1899) *Mar. 9,* 920.
Deposits—Reduction of rate of interest, proposed, *Mar. 9,* 921.
Income Account, Deficiency in—Measures proposed to render Bank self-supporting, *Mar. 7,* 572

[*cont.*

Chamberlain Rt. Hon. J. A.—*cont.*
South African War—Claims against Transvaal and Orange River Colony, *Mar. 6*, 392.
Whiskey—Age Guarantee—Canadian practice, *Mar. 6*, 408.

Chancellor of the Exchequer.—*Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain.*

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northants, E.]
Macedonia, Reform Schemes for—Tabling despatches to foreign countries, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 14.
Natal—Church of England Council Petition, Decision as to, *Mar. 2*, 182, 183.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 7*, 553.

Charing Cross to Mall
See Mall to Charing Cross.

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill
Date of Introduction.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1218.

Chelsea Electricity Supply Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 13*, 1168.

Cheltenham
Electric Light Undertaking, Deficit on—Audit of Town Council accounts.
Q. Sir G. Parker; A. Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 7*, 575.

Chief Secretary for Ireland.—*Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.*

Children
Employment of—Ingathering of Crops—Regulations as to school attendance exemptions.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 7*, 558, 559.
Vaccination of Children of School Age, Legislation as to, proposed.
Os. Duke of Northumberland, *Mar. 10*, 1042–1044; Lord Kenyon, 1044.

China
British troops, Barrack accommodation for, in North China.
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13*, 1175.
Cotton Mills—Report presented, *Mar. 9*, 861.
Wei-hai-Wei, *see that title.*

Church Estates
Commissioners, Reports of, Presented, *Mar. 6*, 386, 389.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S. [Oldham]
Army.
Nine Years Service System, Proposal as to, *Mar. 2*, 247.
Period of Service, Reasons for limiting to twelve years, *Mar. 7*, 635.
Reduction in numbers, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 248, 249.
Reorganisation proposals, *Mar. 2*, 247, 248.
Reserve.
Special Reserve, Information as to, *Mar. 7*, 639.
Strength of, Effect of Nine Years' Service System on, etc, *Mar. 7*, 634, 635.
Vote for, Reduction in, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 642.
Staff, Decrease in Expenditure for—Dual Appointments, etc., *Mar. 2*, 225, 226, 228, 230, 231.
Closure, Regulations as to moving, *Mar. 13*, 1322.
Estimates, Date of taking, *Mar. 9*, 946.
Fiscal Policy—Preferential treatment for Colonies, Food taxation, etc., *Mar. 8*, 805–816, 822.
Indian Army, Reserve for, arrangements as to, *Mar. 7*, 635, 637.
Ireland, Administration of — Reported Resignations of Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary, *Mar. 2*, 295.
MacDonnell, Sir A., Conditions of acceptance of office by, etc., *Mar. 9*, 944.
Navy Estimates, Discussion on, *Mar. 13*, 1332.
Vote A, Discussion of Whole Naval Policy on, *Mar. 13*, 1323.
Russo-Japanese War—British Officers attached to Belligerent Forces, *Mar. 2* 224, 227.
Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14*, 1505.
Transvaal — Chinese Labour — British Soldiers Employed in Suppressing Riots, and bringing back Deserters, alleged, *Mar. 2*, 247.
Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Cost to be Defrayed by the Treasury—Supplementary Estimate for, *Mar. 9*, 1033.
Wyndham, Mr., Resignation of Chief Secretaryship of Ireland by, *Mar. 9*, 1039, 1040.

City of London (Escape from Fire) Bill.
c. 2R., *Mar. 14*, 1401.

Civil Service
 Abstractor Clerks.
  Memorial from, Decision as to.
   Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 2*, 184, 185.
  Promotion Regulations.
   Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 6*, 396.
 Grievances of Officials, Members of Parliament Calling Attention to.
   Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 2*, 167, 168.
 Superannuation—Appointment without Certificate, *Mar. 7*, 531, 554.

Civil Service Estimates
 Supplementary.
  Land Commission, Ireland, Salaries and Expenses of Office of—£700, *Com, Mar. 9*, 947.
  Legal Proceedings—£12,000, *Com., Mar. 9*, 1025.
 Votes on Account—Estimate Presented, *Mar. 6*, 390.

Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., N.]
 Belfast Valuation Appeals—Principle of Valuation, *Mar. 13*, 1211.

Clanricarde Estate
 Evicted Tenants.
  Correspondence between Sir M. H. Beach and Lord Clanricarde in 1886.
   O Mr. Roche, *Mar. 7*, 662–664.
  Number of Applications, Number of Re-instatements, etc.
   Os. Mr. Roche, *Mar. 7*, 661; Mr. Duffy, 691.
  Tuam, Archbishop of, Efforts of, at Meditation.
   O. Mr. Roche, *Mar. 7*, 664–666.

Clare
 Fair Rent Appeals—Dissatisfaction with Reductions, alleged.
   Qs. Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 937; *Mar. 13*, 1217, 1218.

Clay Cross Railway (Abandonment) Bill
 c. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 389.
 Report of Board of Trade Presented, *Mar. 13*, 1171.

Clinton Estate
 Admiralty Purchase of Land—Compensation Award, etc.
   Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 1*, 10.

"Clio," H.M.S.
 Construction—Date of Laying down, and of Completion, Cost, Removal from Active List.
   Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 402, 403.

Clones
 Telegrams, Regulations as to Privacy of.
   Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1361, 1362.

Clonmel
 Court House, County Council Control over use of, by Clubs, etc.
   Qs. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 195, 196.

Clyde
 Naval Vessels Anchored in, Nuisance Caused by.
   O. Mr. Ainsworth, *Mar. 7*, 619, 620.
   Qs. Mr. Ainsworth; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 9*, 916, 917; *Mar. 13*, 1199.

Clyde Navigation (Reconstitution) Bill
 l. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 385.

Coagh
 Nationalist Procession, Prohibition of.
   Qs. Mr. Doogan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 418, 419.

Coal
 Exports for 1904—Return Ordered, *Mar. 2*, 296.
 Supply of—Royal Commission of Inquiry—Reports, Date of Publication of.
   Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas, *Mar. 8*, 703, 704.

Coal Mines
 Boys Employed in, Number of.
   Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13*, 1190, 1191.

Coastguards
 Orkney—Establishment of Station on Island of Sanday, proposed.
   Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 2*, 164, 165.

Cogan, Mr. D. J. [Wicklow, E.]
 Dublin—Phœnix Park Footpaths used by Cyclists, *Mar. 2*, 199.
 Local Government Board Public Bodies Order, 1904, Objections to, *Mar. 2*, 191.

Cohen, Mr. B. L. [Islington, E.]
 Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3*, 358.
 National Telephone Company, Progress of Negotiations with, *Mar. 6*, 409.
 Public Buildings (Expenses) Act 1898 Fund, Sale of Consols under, *Mar. 6*, 409.

Coleridge, Lord
 India—Import Duties, Question of Retaliation, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1138–1140.

Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir J. C. R. [Great Yarmouth]
 Admiralty.
  Changes at—Terms of Order in Council, etc., *Mar. 6*, 477–480.
  First Sea Lord, Changes in Office of, Information as to, *Mar. 6*, 479, 480.
  Inspector of Target Practice for the Fleet, Duties and Emoluments of, etc., *Mar. 6*, 479, 480.

[*cont.*

Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir J. C. R.—*cont.*

Army Rifles, Long, Adaptation of, for Clip-loading, *Mar. 6.* 402.

Land Commissioners—Information as to proposed Increase in Staff, *Mar. 9,* 985.

Land Purchase Advances—Delay in Placing Loans, etc., *Mar. 9,* 985.

Navy.

Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 13,* 1284, 1285.

Dockyards, Administration of, Constitution of, Committee on, *Mar. 13,* 1283.

Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 13,* 1282.

Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 13,* 1236, 1284.

Officers, Sea Service as a Qualification for Advancement of, Publication of Order in Council Relating to, proposed., *Mar. 6,* 478.

Pacific, British Position in, Necessity for Maintaining a Strong Fleet, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1285, 1286.

Personnel, Re-distribution of, under the New Scheme, *Mar. 13,* 1284, 1285.

Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 6,* 476.

Ship-building—Designs.

Committee on, Constitution and Terms of Reference of, *Mar. 13,* 1282, 1283.

Secrecy as to, *Mar. 13,* 1282.

Stations at Halifax and Esquimault handed over to Canadian Government, *Mar. 14,* 1373.

Submarines, Construction of, *Mar. 6,* 476; *Mar. 13,* 1283.

Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Policy of constructing Inferior Type of, *Mar. 13,* 1283, 1284.

Colonial Forest Service Department

Transfer of, From Cooper's Hill, to University of Oxford, proposed.

Os. Earl of Lytton, *Mar. 7,* 534–538, 549–552; Marquess of Bath, 538–544; Marquess of Lansdowne, 546, 547; Viscount Goschen, 547–549; Bishop of Bristol, 549.

Alternative Proposals.

Os. Earl of Lytton, *Mar. 7,* 535, 536; Marquess of Bath, 542.

Exclusion of other Universities, Objections to.

Os. Earl of Lytton, *Mar. 7,* 534, 535, 549, 550; Marquess of Bath, 541; Marquess of Lansdowne, 547.

Experimental Term, Reduction in.

O. Marquess of Bath, *Mar. 7,* 543.

Colonial Office

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. A. Lyttelton.

Colonies

American Goods, Preferential Customs Treatment for—Number of Treaties Negotiated.

Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 9,* 913.

Appropriations in Aid, Information as to.

Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 2,* 219; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 222.

Imports—Customs Duties on British Goods Compared with those on Foreign Goods.

Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8,* 712.

Postal Orders—Amendment (No. 2) Regulations, Presented, *Mar. 13,* 1131, 1171.

Preferential Trade with the Mother Country, *see under* Fiscal Policy.

Report, Annual, Presented, *Mar. 3,* 298, 317.

Reports Presented, *Mar. 3,* 298, 317.

Representative Institutions, Method of Conferring.

Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 1,* 13.

Return Ordered, *Mar. 7,* 554.

Sugar Bounties, Representation as to Abolition of, proposed.

Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 1,* 12.

Colthurst, Sir G., Estate of

Sale of—Stipulations as to Turbary Rights of Tenants.

Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Atkinson *Mar. 9,* 930, 931.

Commerce, Ministry of

Establishment of—Date of Introduction of Bill.

Q. Sir A. Rollit; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 8,* 733.

Committees

Police and Sanitary—Appointment and Terms of Reference, *Mar. 2,* 162, 163

Privileges—Nomination of Members, *Mar. 13,* 1331.

Public Petitions—Nomination of Members, *Mar. 13,* 1331.

Select—Appointment of Railway Directors to Act on Committees on Railway Bills, Procedure as to.

Os. Mr. P. O'Brien, *Mar. 14,* 1381–1383; Mr. Wodehouse, 1381; Mr. J. Redmond, 1382.

Standing—Nomination of Members, etc., *Mar. 3,* 298; *Mar. 7,* 531, 596, 597; *Mar. 10,* 1041, 1042; *Mar. 14,* 1397.

Companies
Dentist, Registration of—Prevention of Evasions of Acts.
Q. Sir J. Tuke; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1189.
Q. Sir J. Tuke; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 14*, 1363.
Case of Attorney-General *v.* Appleton.
Q. Sir J. Tuke; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1189.
Directorships Held by Ministers of the Crown.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 429.
One-Man Companies, Sale of Poisons by.
Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr G. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1188.
Promotion of, by Undischarged Bankrupts, Legislation to Prevent, proposed, *Mar. 8*, 719.

Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill
c. 2R. *Mar. 3*, 348.
Debate (Commons), *Mar. 3*, 348.
Afforestation, Protection of, 360.
American Law, 352, 358.
Conditions of Acquisition of Land by Railway Companies, 356, 366.
Express Trains, Increased Danger from, 352, 361.
Farmers, Opinion of, 359, 360, 367.
Heather, Game and Plantations, Inclusion of, 372.
Incendiary Fires, Safeguarding against Claims for, 357, 373.
Limit of Distance for Sparks Falling, 357, 362.
Prevention of Sparks the True Remedy, 353, 359, 361, 362, 366, 370, 372, 373.
Right to Claim Compensation under Existing Acts, Procedure, etc., 350, 354, 355, 361, 363, 364, 365, 368, 370, 371.

Comyn Kenny Estate
Grazing Lands, Disposal of.
Qs. Mr. Roche; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1*, 9; *Mar. 6*, 419, 420.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
Expediting Work of, and Enlarging Powers, proposed.
Os. Mr. Hayden, *Mar. 14*, 1467; Mr. Atkinson, 1483; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1489.

Congested Districts Board, Scotland
Fishermen, Making Loans to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 7*, 579.
Funds, Augmentation of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 426, 427.

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill
l. Com. and *Rep.* Mar. 6*, 386.

Congo Free State
Belgian Administration.
British Consular Representation in the Upper Congo.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 7*, 570, 571.
Commission of Inquiry—Details as to Evidence.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 6*, 393, 394, 408.
Currie, Rev. W. T., Report of—Presentation, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 6*, 394.
Forts, Building of, Increase of Troops, etc., Information as to.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 13*, 1173.
Employment in—Warning to Native Workmen Issued by Government of Lagos.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8*, 713.

Connaught
Distress in, Cause of, and Method of Dealing with.
Os. Mr. Hayden, *Mar. 14*, 1463; Mr. J. Redmond, 1471.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
[*For particular places see their names.*]
Inspectors, Average Number of Men in the Charge of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 909.
McGarry, Constable, Charges against.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 191; *Mar. 7*, 565.
Rasharkin, Transfers of Force at.
Qs. Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 193, 194.
Reductions Effected in.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 586; *Mar. 9*, 909.
Proportion between Officers and Men.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14*, 1389.
Salaries, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 586.
Sullivan, Sergeant, Case of—Evidence of Handwriting Expert.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker *Mar. 7*, 582.

Continuation Schools Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 6*, 386.

Conventual and Monastic Institutions
Increase in, Inspection of, etc.
Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13,* 1202.

Convocations of the Clergy Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 9.* 863.

Cooper's Hill College
Abolition of, Decision as to.
Os. Earl of Lytton, *Mar. 7,* 533; Lord Thring, 538; Marquess of Bath, 539 Marquess of Lansdowne, 546.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
Conventual and Monastic Institutions, Increase in, Inspection of, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1202.
Labourers, Ireland, Condition of, Improvement in, Failure of Government to deal with, *Mar. 1,* 106–108.
Roman Catholic University Question, Government Attitude towards, *Mar. 6,* 418.

County of London Electric Supply Company Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 3,* 297.

Cornwall, Duchy of
Lord Warden—Earl of Ducie

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim. S.]
Dungannon—Plans for Drumglass School, *Mar. 1,* 28.
Labourers, Condition of, Improvement in, Failure of Government to deal with, *Mar. 1,* 110–113.
Labourers Bill of 1904, Terms of, *Mar. 1,* 111, 112.
United Irish League Outrage at Dingle, alleged, *Mar. 1,* 23.

Crean
Arnott Estate, Apportionment of, for Sale purposes, alleged, *Mar. 8,* 726, 727.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
India—Expenditure, Reason for Increase in, *Mar. 9,* 919.
Post Office, Sick Leave Regulations—Case of Mr. Emberson, *Mar. 8,* 703.

Crime
Statistics relating to, for 1903, Delay in Publication of, alleged.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 14,* 1377.

Crimean War
Martin, Ex-Sergeant, Claim of, for Increase of Pension.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 14,* 1369.

Criminal Appeal, Court of
Establishment of, proposed.
Q. Sir R. Reid; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 8,* 731.

Criminal Law
Administration of—Conviction of Innocent Persons, Appointment of Committee of Inquiry as to, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 8,* 730, 731.

Criminal New Trials Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 8,* 855.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]
Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 365.

Crofters Act, 1886
Extension to Buteshire proposed, Introduction of Bill for.
Q. Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1223, 1224.

Crofters Holdings (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar.* 9, 946.

Crofton, Lord, Estate of
Sale of Grazing Land.
Q. Mr. Jas. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 192.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
Fiscal Policy—Colonial Conference, Subjects to be discussed at, *Mar. 13,* 1227, 1228.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Army—Contracts for Guns—Private Firms—Regulations as to Tests and Specifications, *Mar. 7,* 567.
Education—Fees for Secondary School Attendance, *Mar. 7,* 577.
Navy—Obsolete Ships, Breaking up, in England, proposed, *Mar. 13,* 1200.
Poor Law Medical Officers—Regulations as to Extra Appointments held by, *Mar. 13,* 1189.
Woolwich Barracks, Works at—Provision for Married Soldiers, *Mar. 13,* 1181.

Croydon Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 6,* 389.

Cuba
Treaty with United States—Effect of, on British Trade.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 1,* 13, 14.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
Clonmel Court House, Use of, by Club, etc., *Mar. 2,* 195, 196.
Evictions—Reinstatements.
Compensation to Present Owners who have Purchased Holdings, *Mar. 2,* 194, 195.
Progress made with, *Mar. 9,* 948–952.
Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Scheme, Progress made with, *Mar. 9,* 930.
King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Mar. 1,* 103–106.

[*cont.*

Cullinan, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Land Act, 1903.
Applications for Loans under, Number and Amount of, *Mar. 1*, 104.
Officials, Return as to, *Mar. 1*, 21.
Land Commission, Work of, Unsatisfactory Nature of, Delays, etc., *Mar. 9*, 948–952.
Tipperary Court House, Use of, for Social Amusements, *Mar. 7*, 589.

Currygranny
Postal arrangements, Improvement in.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 1*, 28.

Cusack Estate
Sale of, Circumstances of.
O. Mr. Farrell, *Mar. 9*, 960.

Customs and Excise
Promotions, Compensation for Retardation of.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 13*, 1191, 1192.
Watchers, Duties and Remuneration of.
Q. Mr. Causton; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 6*, 397.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Agriculture, Board of—Date of Appointing President, *Mar. 9*, 1039.
Army—Civilians attached to Units, pay of, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2*, 288.
MacDonnell, Sir A., Rumoured decision to dismiss, *Mar. 13*, 1227.
Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3*, 378.
Unopposed Returns, Objections to, After Midnight, *Mar. 9*, 1038.
Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of.
Attorney-General, Responsibility of for not setting Public Prosecutor in Motion, *Mar. 9*, 1030.
Costs to be defrayed by the Treasury —Supplementary Estimate for, *Mar. 9*, 1030, 1031, 1033.

Darien Gold Mining Company Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 10*, 1041.

Davenport, Mr. W. B.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Cheshire, Macclesfield]
Africa, South, Garrison in, Cost of Maintenance of, *Mar. 2*, 209.
Hanley, Private J., Case of, *Mar. 8*, 701.
Indian Army—Terms of Service, *Mar. 2*, 210.
Pay of Civilians attached to Units, Explanation of Vote for, *Mar. 2*, 287, 288, 290, 291.
Regimental Allowances and Expenses, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2*, 282.
Russo-Japanese War—British Officers attached to Belligerent Forces, *Mar. 2*, 214, 224.

Davonport, Mr. W. B.—*cont.*
Somaliland Expedition, Cost of.
Estimate for, *Mar. 2*, 207, 208.
Total, *Mar. 2*, 207.
Staff, Expenditure for, Increase in—Dual Appointments, etc., *Mar. 2*, 225, 226.
Three Years' System, Working of, *Mar. 2*, 209.

Davey, Lord
Street Betting Bill, *Com.* and *Rep.*, *Mar. 2*, 160, 161.

De Freyne Estate
Sale of—Progress of Negotiations.
Qs. Mr. Hayden; *As.* Mr Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 196; *Mar. 6*, 420, 421; *Mar. 9*, 935.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8*, 727.

Dearne Valley Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 385.

Defence of the Empire
Blocking Entrance to fortified Harbours by Sinking Vessels, Difficulties of.
O. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 300.
Coasts and Harbours, Securing Against Surprise before commencement of Hostilities, Provisions for.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 300, 301, 309; Earl of Selborne, 313; Earl Spencer, 315.
Dissemination of News, Possibility of Checking.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 300, 308, 309, 310; Earl of Selborne, 313, 314; Earl Spencer, 315, 316.
Forts, Necessity of Keeping, in a State of Preparedness.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 302, 303, 308.
Home Defence, Force necessary for—Decision of Defence Committee.
Q. Colonel Welby; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 7*, 595.
Invasion, Possibilities of, and Precautions against.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 300, 303–306; Earl of Selborne, 311, 312.
Q. Colonel Welby; *A.* Mr. A. J. Baltour, *Mar. 14*, 1393, 1394.
"Mare Clausum," Revival of Doctrine of, in event of War.
O. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar.* 3, 309
Railway Telegraphs, connection of, with Government Offices, Dockyards, etc. proposed.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 30
Submarines, use of Neutral bases and Waters by, International law as to.
O. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 302
Torpedo attacks, Possibilities of, and Safeguards against.
O. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3*, 302,

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's Co., Ossory]
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department.
  - Grievances of Staff, Inquiry into, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 420.
  - Salaries, Treasury sanction to increase of, *Mar. 14,* 1389.
  - Staff, Representations as to alleged inequality in treatment of, *Mar. 9,* 934.
  - Veterinary Branch Clerks, position of, *Mar. 1,* 22, 27; *Mar. 9,* 926.
- Constabulary, Royal Irish.
  - Inspectors, Average number of Men in the charge of, *Mar. 9,* 909.
  - Maryborough Police Force, Reduction in, proposed, *Mar. 7,* 586.
  - Reductions effected in, *Mar. 7.* 586; *Mar. 9,* 909; *Mar. 14,* 1389.
  - Salaries, Information as to, *Mar. 7,* 586.
- Evictions—Re-instatement of Tenants, Progress made with, *Mar. 9,* 986–988.
- Land Act 1903, Inspectors appointed under, *Mar. 1,* 21.
- Land Commissioners—Information as to proposed increase in staff, *Mar. 9,* 986.
- Local Government Board Public Bodies Order 1904 and Union Accounts Order 1904, Objections to, *Mar. 2,* 189.
- Luggacurran Estate—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenant, *Mar. 6,* 415.
- Swine Fever outbreaks, restrictions on movement of Swine, etc., *Mar. 2,* 196, 197.

Dennehy Estate
- Purchase of—Progress of Negotiations.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8,* 723, 724.

Denny, Col. J. M. [Kilmarnock Burghs.]
- France, Public Works in—Exclusion of foreign-made material, *Mar. 1,* 15.

Deputy-Chairman [Mr. Jeffreys]
- Closure, Regulations as to moving, *Mar. 13,* 1322.
- Private Business, Discussion of, on Friday, out of order, *Mar. 10,* 1046

Derrycassan
- Jordan, J., Case of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 926, 927.

Derrygonelly
- Sanitary condition of, Inquiry into.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Mitchell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1218.

Derrylaur
- Electoral Division, Area of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1175, 1176.

Devlin, Mr. C. R. [Galway]
- Galway.
  - Harbour, Dredging of, etc., *Mar. 9,* 937, 938; *Mar. 13,* 1222, 1223
  - Mill Stream, clearing—Expenditure by Board of Works, *Mar. 14,* 1392.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, N.]
- Belfast—Valuation principles, *Mar. 7,* 585; *Mar. 13,* 1210, 1211.
- Dublin Post Office—North of Ireland, improvement in service to, *Mar. 14,* 1393.
- Education—Schools—Age limit for boys, *Mar. 13,* 1176.
- Inland Revenue Collectors' Offices, Clerks in—Pay for Extra Duty, *Mar. 7,* 572.
- Navy.
  - Flogging in, *Mar. 14,* 1448.
  - Stations at Halifax and Esquimault handed over to Canadian Government, *Mar. 14,* 1373.
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney-General for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9,* 1031, 1032.

Dewar, Mr. J. A. [Inverness]
- Highlands, West, Improvement of Mail Service in, *Mar. 9,* 923.

Dewar, Sir T. R. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
- Accidents in London Streets, caused by Gas in contact with leakage of Electricity, *Mar. 13,* 1190.
- Aliens, Number of, in Prisons, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1203, 1204.
- Ambulance Service, Metropolitan, Improvement of, *Mar. 1,* 5.
- Metric System, Adoption of, proposed, *Mar. 1,* 5.
- Poison, Accidents caused by, Precautions against, *Mar. 13,* 1204.
- Telephone Service.
  - Call-boxes, Ventilation of, *Mar. 14,* 1360.
  - London, in, Progress made with establishment of, *Mar. 1,* 18.
- Vans, Covered, Accidents with, in London—Operation of new Bye-law, *Mar. 1,* 12.

Dickson, Rt. Hon. C. S.—*Lord Advocate* [Glasgow, Bridgton]
- Achintee River, Footbridge across, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 413.
- Caithness and Sutherland Fishing Industry, Inquiry into Depression of—Date of Report, *Mar. 2,* 165.
- Congested Districts Board—Loans to Fishermen proposed, *Mar. 7,* 579.
- Crofters Act, Extension of, to Leaseholders, *Mar. 1,* 19.
- Ecclesiastical Buildings, Rating of, *Mar. 13,* 1210.

[*cont.*

Dickson, Rt. Hon. C. S.—*cont.*
- Education [Scotland] Bill, Intro, *Mar. 8*, 735–739.
- Equivalent Grant, Disposal of, *Mar. 1*, 19.
- Lewis, Island of.
  - Fisheries.
    - Mansfield Commission, Inclusion in Scope of, proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1209.
    - Quantity of Fish landed in 1901–1904, *Mar. 13*, 1209.
  - Health Officer for, Appointment of, etc., *Mar. 14*, 1384.
  - Ness Harbour, Clearing of Sand, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1383.
  - Shader Landing Place, Work at, Delay in proceeding with, *Mar. 7*, 579.
- Local Government Board—Additional Medical Inspectors proposed, *Mar. 6*, 412.
- May, Isle of—Protection of Fisheries, Report by Lightkeepers of Illegal trawling, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1188.
- Milk Supply—Government Inspection of Stock, *Mar. 7*, 579.
- Motor Traffic, Heavy, Regulations for, *Mar. 2*, 186.
- North Sea Fishery Investigations, Vessels employed in, *Mar. 8*, 721.
- Peebleshire County Council—Clerk acting as Parliamentary Agent, Regulations as to, *Mar. 6*, 413.
- Physical Deterioration Committee Recommendations, Issuing, to Parochial Medical Officers, etc., proposed, *Mar. 6*, 412.
- Stornoway—Battery Park—Sites for Fishermen's Dwellings, Progress with houses, *Mar. 7*, 578.
- Trawling.
  - Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Number, Nationalities, etc., *Mar. 8*, 721.
  - Norwegian Trawlers carrying British Crews, Right of, to fish in Territorial Waters—Tabling Correspondence, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 187.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
- National Telephone Company, Agreement of, with Post Office—Transfer of Staff, *Mar. 13*, 1185.
- Navy—Royal Fleet Reserve, Present Strength of, *Mar. 10*, 1047.
- Workmen's Compensation Act—Government Employees, Scheme accepted by, *Mar. 9*, 905.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
- Evictions and Reinstatements. Information as to, *Mar. 3*, 322; Return as to, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 8.
- Land Act, 1903—Adminstration by Estates Commissioners, *Mar. 13*, 1212.

Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir J. C. [London]
- London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 14*, 1462.

Dingle
- United Irish League Outrage at, alleged. *Q.* Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1*, 23, 24.

Dingwall
- Post Office, Enlarged Accommodation at, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir, *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1207.

Dockyards
- *See under* Navy.

Dogs Bill
- c. 1R.* *Mar. 8*, 734.

"Dominion," H.M.S.
- Gun Sights of, New System of Gearing, etc.
  - *O.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*, 1256.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
- Labourers in Ireland, Condition of, Improvement in, Failure of Government to deal with, etc., *Mar. 1*, 101, 102.
- Western Australia, Treatment of Aborigines in, *Mar. 1*, 10.

Donoughmore, Earl of—*Under Secretary for War.*
- Military Manœuvres Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 151–155; *Com.*, *Mar. 9*, 877–879, 882, 885, 886, 888.

Doogan, Mr. P. C. [Tyrone, E.]
- Coagh Nationalist Procession, Prohibition of, *Mar. 6*, 418, 419.

Dopping Hepenstall Estate
- Sale of, Negotiations as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 927, 928.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*Secretary of State Home Department* [Kent, St. Augustine's]
- Ambulance Service, Metropolitan, Improvement of, *Mar. 1*, 5.
- Coal, Supply of—Royal Commission of Inquiry Reports, Date of Publishing, 704.
- Coal Mines, Number of Boys Employed in, *Mar. 13*, 1191.
- Companies, Registration of—Prevention of Evasions of Medical and Dental Acts, *Mar. 14*, 1363.
- Conventual and Monastic Institutions, Inspection of, Increase in Number of etc., *Mar. 13*, 1202.
- Criminal Statistics for 1903, Alleged Delay in Publication of, *Mar. 14*, 1377.
- Fire, Protection from, Date of Appointing Committee to consider, *Mar. 10*, 1051.

[*cont.*

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*cont.*
- London Street Accidents due to Gas in contact with leakage of Electricity, *Mar. 13,* 1190.
- Mines.
  - Accidents in, Returns as to—Inclusion of Accidents for which Compensation is paid by Employers, proposed, *Mar. 10,* 1051.
  - Coal, Number of Boys Employed in, *Mar. 13,* 1191.
  - Electricity in, New Rules for—Date of coming into force, *Mar. 9,* 922.
- Poisons, Accidents caused by, Precautions against, *Mar. 13,* 1191, 1204.
- Prisons.
  - Aliens in, Number of, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1204.
  - Hair-cutting Regulations for Prisoners under Remand, *Mar. 6,* 399.
- Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Case of Mr. P. Cook, *Mar. 8,* 716, 717.
- Vans, Covered, Accidents with, in London—Operation of new Bye-law, *Mar. 1,* 18.

"Drake," H.M.S.
- Gun sights of, Improvement in.
  - *O.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13,* 1256.

Drogheda
- Postal Facilities to Virginia Road, Improvement of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8,* 728.

Drumlish
- Purchase of, Under Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14,* 1365.

Dublin
- Carmen in, Police Proceedings against, for obstruction.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 10,* 1047.
- Joint Stock Companies, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 2,* 199.
- Joint Stock Companies and Limited Liability Companies.
  - Capital of—Return Ordered, *Mar. 14,* 1503.
  - Rateable Valuation of — Return Ordered, *Mar. 14,* 1503.
- Metropolitan Police—Refusal of Sergeant Booth to Investigate Case of Theft from man named Hannon, alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 908.
- Phœnix Park Footpaths, Restrictions on use of, by Cyclists.
  - *Q.* Mr. Cogan; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 2,* 199.
- Post Office.
  - Duties, Allocation of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13,* 1221.

Dublin—*cont.*
- Post Office—*cont.*
  - Overtime of Postmen at Christmas, Payment for.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 7,* 591, 592.
  - Service to North of Ireland, Improvement in.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14,* 1393.
  - Sorters, Auxiliary, Employment of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 7,* 592, 593
- Trinity College, *see that title.*
- Viceregal Lodge, Painting Work at.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 2,* 198.

Dublin Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill
- c. 2R.* *Mar.* 7, 553.

Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
- Civil Service Abstractor Clerks, Promotion of, *Mar. 6,* 396.
- Derrylaur Electoral Division, Area of, *Mar. 13,* 1175.
- Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement of, *Mar. 7,* 690–692.
- Potatoes, Seed, Free Distribution of, in Distressed Districts, proposed, *Mar. 14,* 1358.

Duke, Mr. H. E. [Plymouth]
- Navy Dockyards.
  - Administration of, Reforms in, *Mar. 6,* 483–485.
  - Employees' Grievances, Appeal to the Admiralty, etc., *Mar. 6,* 484.
- Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R. *Mar. 10,* 1080–1085.

Dunboyne, Lord
- Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill, 2R. *Mar. 7,* 531.

Dungannon
- Drumglass School, Plans for.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 1,* 28, 29.

Ealing Corporation Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Mar. 14,* 1355.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
- Revenue and Expenditure of, 1890–1904.
  - *Q.* Mr. Stevenson; *A.* Sir L. Knowles. *Mar. 9,* 904.

Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Mar. 7,* 553.

Edgeworthstown
- Post Office—Parcels Delivery Arrangements.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 1,* 28.

Education, Board of
- *President*—Marquess of Londonderry.
- *Secretary*—Sir W. R. Anson

Education (England and Wales)
- Girls' Public Day School Company, Profits of, Grant Paid to, etc.
  - *Qs.* Sir G. Bartley; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 13,* 1208.
- Grants.
  - Aid Grant under Voluntary Schools Act—Report Presented, *Mar. 2,* 149.
  - Conditional Payment on Medical Inspection of Children in Elementary Schools, proposed.
    - *Q.* Sir J. Gorst; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 6,* 398.
  - Statistics Presented, *Mar. 1,* 3.
- Irish Language, Teaching, in Schools.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 7,* 578.
- King's Scholars.
  - Applications for Entrance to Residential Colleges.
    - *Q.* Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 7,* 559, 560.
  - Places Available for.
    - *Q.* Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 2,* 170.
- Medical Inspection of Children in Public Elementary Schools, and Conditional Payment of Grants, proposed.
  - *Q.* Sir J. Gorst; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 6,* 398.
- Rate, Increase in.
  - *Os.* Lord Stanley of Alderley, Bishop of Bristol, *Mar. 9,* 894; Lord Harris, 895; Marquess of Londonderry, 896.
- Scholarship System, Abandonment of.
  - *O.* Marquess of Londonderry, *Mar. 9,* 897.
- Schools.
  - Attendance.
    - Circular 512, Enforcement of.
      - *Q.* Mr. G. White; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 9,* 912.
    - Employment of Children, Regulations as to, for ingathering of Crops.
      - *Q.* Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 7,* 558, 559.
    - Residence outside Local Authority Area, Regulation as to.
      - *Q.* Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 9,* 912.
  - Broughton Gifford School, Building Grant to.
    - *Q.* Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 3,* 318.

Education (England and Wales—*cont.*
- Schools—*cont.*
  - Secondary—Fees and Free Places, Regulations as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Crooks; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 7,* 577.
    - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 13,* 1209.
    - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1228.
- Teachers.
  - Probationer System.
    - *Os.* Vis. Galway, *Mar. 9,* 890; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 891, 897; Marquess of Londonderry, 897.
  - Pupil.
    - Country Candidates, encouragement of.
      - *Os.* Vis. Galway, *Mar. 9,* 890; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 891; Lord Harris, 896; Marquess of Londonderry, 897.
    - Grants for.
      - *Os.* Lord Stanley of Alderley, *Mar. 9,* 893; Lord Harris, 895; Marquess of Londonderry, 897.
      - Circular Presented, *Mar. 10,* 1041, 1046.
- Training Colleges—Accommodation for Women Students.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 14,* 1363.
- Underfed Children—Free Meals for, Proposals as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. K. Hardie, Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 8,* 731–733.
  - *Q.* Sir J. Gorst; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 13,* 1184, 1185.

Education (Ireland)
- Dale, Mr., Report of, Observations of Commissioners on.
  - *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 589.
- Grants for Technical Instruction, *see sub-heading* Technical.
- Manual Instructresses qualified to Act as Assistant Mistresses, Numbers employed, Rate of Remuneration, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 10,* 1052, 1053.
- National School Teachers.
  - Grievances—Resolution of Strabane Teachers' Association.
    - *Q.* Mr. Hemphill; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 21, 22.
  - Pension Fund.
    - Abstract, Printing of.
      - *Q.* Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 7,* 593.
    - Account Presented, *Mar. 13,* 1170.

[*cont.*

Education Ireland—*cont.*
National School Teachers—*cont.*
Pension Fund.—*cont.*
Administration of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar.* 2, 198, 199.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 6, 402.
Q. Mr. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar.* 7, 593.
Investigation into, Date of holding, etc.
Qs. Mr. McHugh; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar.* 13, 1221, 1222.
Pensions.
Amounts of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar.* 2, 75.
Number of Teachers in Receipt of Maximum Pension payable, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 10, 1053.
Promotions, Information as to.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar.* 7, 593.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 9, 910.
Rule 127b, Effect of, on Men Teachers.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 13, 1176.
Salaries, Method of Determining.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 13, 1193, 1194.
Rules, New, Date of Issue of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 13, 1177.
Schools.
[*For particular schools see names of places*].
Age Regulations for Male Schools.
Q. Mr. McNeill; A. Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 7, 588.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 13, 1176.
Amalgamation of Boys' and Girls' Schools, and Joint Infant Department proposed.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. W Long, *Mar.* 14, 1366.
Model—Disposal of Fees of Pupils.
Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 1, 26, 27.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar.* 7, 558.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 7, 564.
Technical, Funds available for.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 7, 562, 563.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 7, 588.
Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 8, 722.

Education Ireland—*cont.*
Training Schools—De la Salla College.
Report on, etc.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 14, 1388.

Education Scotland
Day Schools—Code of Regulations for 1905, Presented, *Mar.* 10, 1041, 1047.
Equivalent Grant, Disposal of, in Highland Crofting Counties.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar.* 1, 19.
Teachers, Training of—Minute, Opportunity of Discussing.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* 7, 594.

Education [Scotland] Bill
c. Intro, *Mar.* 8, 735.
1R.* *Mar.* 8, 740.
Debate on Introduction [Commons] *Mar.* 8, 735.
Burghs, date of holding Elections in, 736.
Counties, Division of, powers as to, granted to Secretary for Scotland, 736.
Debts.
Elementary or primary schools, charges in respect of, to be placed on parishes, 737, 738.
Higher grade or secondary schools, charges in respect of, to be placed on whole district, 737, 738.
Districts, Division of, powers as to, granted to Secretary for Scotland, 736.
Financial Arrangements—Allocation of monies derived from the Fund, 739.
Managers.
Appointment of, to be optional in enumerated districts and compulsory in others, 736.
School Board, of, regulations as to appointment of, 737.
Printing and circulating Bill in Scotland at an early date, proposed, 740.
Provincial Councils, Extension of powers of, proposed, 739.
Rating.
Clause as to, recommitted, 737, 740.
Deficiency, method of collecting, 738.
Sanitary inspection of schools, arrangements as to, 739.
School Boards.
Books, provision of, special facilities to be granted for, 739
Managers, powers as to appointment of, 737.

Education Authorities (Access to Book and Documents) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 10,* 1127.

Education (Local Authority Default) Act, 1904
Application of, Information as to.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 7,* 577, 578.

Egypt
Convention between United Kingdom and France as to, presented, *Mar. 2,* 150.
Mecca Pilgrims—Theft of Charitable funds from Mahmal Escort.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 8,* 713

Electric Railways
See Railways—Electric.

Electricity
Mines, New rules for the use of electricity in—Date of coming into force.
Q Mr. Fenwick; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 9,* 921, 922.

Elibank, Master of
Army.
Highland Regiments, Grouping of, under new depôt scheme, *Mar. 8,* 706.
Officers—Applications and appointments for residence and study in Japan, *Mar. 2,* 179.
Peebleshire County Council—Clerk acting as Parliamentary agent. regulations as to, *Mar. 6,* 413.

Ellenborough, Lord
Defence of the Empire, provisions against surprise, invasion, etc., *Mar. 3,* 299-311
Navy.
Distribution of the Fleet, changes in, *Mar. 3,* 300, 311.
Reserve Squadron, constitution of, *Mar. 3,* 300.

Ellice, Capt. E. C. [St. Andrews Burghs.]
May, Isle of—Protection of fisheries, Report by Lightkeepers of illegal trawling, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1188.
Trawling—Norwegian trawlers carrying British crews, Right of, to fish in Territorial waters—Tabling of Correspondence proposed, *Mar. 2,* 187.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
MacDonnell, Sir A., Conditions of appointment of, communication of, *Mar. 9,* 943.
Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill, Com., *Mar. 10,* 1046.

Ellis; Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
Railway Accidents.
Electric rail, due to, number and prevention of, *Mar. 7,* 574.
Return for 1904, Date of presenting etc., *Mar. 14,* 1364.
Somaliland Expedition, Cost of, *Mar. 8,* 746.
Supply, application of Closure to, *Mar. 14,* 1507.

Elphin.
Postal Service to Longford, improvement of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9,* 940.

Emigration and Immigration
Emigrants' Information Office 1904—Report Presented, *Mar. 9,* 862, 903.
Ireland, Emigration from—Lack of Remunerative Employment in Ireland the Chief Cause of.
Qs. Mr. Flynn, *Mar. 1,* 109, 110; Mr. O'Shaughnessy, 116; Mr. Sloan, 119.
Poor Law Guardians, Power of, to Assist Destitute Persons to Emigrate.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 2,* 184.

Enfield Small Arms Factory
see under Army—Ordnance Factories.

Epizootic Lymphangitis
see under Horses.

Epping Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 1.

Esmonde, Sir T. G [Wexford, N.]
"Albert" wreck, Removal of, and Payment of Compensation to Fishermen, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 396; *Mar. 13,* 1189.
Franciscan Manuscripts, Progress Made with Printing, *Mar. 6,* 395.
Poulduff Pier Reconstruction, Progress made with, *Mar. 7,* 564.
War Office Abstractor Clerks, Retirement Regulations for, *Mar. 6,* 395.
Wexford Evictions and Reinstatements, Information as to, *Mar. 13,* 1187.

Esquimault
British Garrison in, Withdrawal of, *see under* Canada—British Garrisons.

Estate Duty
Authority of Officials to Interpret Sec. 21 (1) of Statute.
Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 10,* 1052.
Colonial Securities, Double Payment on, Prevention of.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. S. Lyttelton, *Mar. 9,* 903, 904.
Office—List of Public Records of not sufficient value to justify preservation, Presented, *Mar. 14,* 1358.

Estimates
- Army Estimates, *and* Navy Estimates, *see those titles.*
- Committee to Examine and Report on, Prior to Discussion in Committee of Supply, proposed.
  - *Os.* Sir E. Vincent, *Mar. 1,* 52; Sir R. Reid, 55, 56; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 86, 87.
- Discussion of, Inadequate Facilities for.
  - *Os.* Sir R. Reid, *Mar. 1,* 55; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 93.
- Supplementary, Objections to System of.
  - *Os.* Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 1,* 68, 69.

Evictions, Ireland
for particular places see their names.
- Landlord and Tenant, Relations between.
  - *Os.* Mr. K. O'Brien, *Mar. 7,* 657, 658; Mr. H. Robertson, 667, 668.
- Reinstatements.
  - Compensation in Money or Land to Present Owners who have Purchased Evicted Holdings.
    - *Os.* Mr. Cullinan, *Mar. 9,* 950, 951, 975, 976; Mr. Atkinson, 975; Mr. Kilbride, 998.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Cullinan, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 194, 195.
  - Government Pledges, etc.
    - *Os.* Mr. K. O'Brien, *Mar. 7,* 657–659; Mr. Roche, 659-666; Mr. H. Robertson, 668; Mr. J. Redmond, 669–672; Mr. Atkinson, 672–680; Mr. J. Morley, 681-684; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 684–687; Mr. T. W. Russell, 688–690; Mr. Duffy, 690–692.
  - Information as to.
    - *Os.* Mr. J. Redmond, *Mar. 7,* 670, 671; Mr. Atkinson, 672, 673; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 685.
    - *Q.* Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 3,* 322.
  - Land Act 1903, Tabling Regulations under, proposed.
    - *Qs.* Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6,* 421, 422.
  - Method of, Purchase of Estates and Untenanted Land, etc.
    - *Os.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 676, 677; Mr. Cullinan, *Mar. 9,* 948; Mr. Atkinson, 974.
  - Progress made with.
    - *Os.* Mr. Cullinan, *Mar. 9,* 948–950; Mr. Atkinson, 974; Mr. Murphy 983, 984; Mr. Delany, 986–988; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 994; Mr. Kilbride, 996.
  - Regulations as to, Tabling.
    - *Os.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7.* 678–680; Mr. T. W. Russell, 679, 680, 687; Mr. J. Redmond, 679, 692; Mr. J. Morley, 681.
  - Return of, proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 8.

Expenditure
see Revenue and Expenditure.

Fair Rents, Ireland
see under Land Commission.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
- Aghnacliffe Postal Arrangements, Improvement of, *Mar. 14,* 1361.
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Board, Powers and Duties of, *Mar. 1,* 20, 21.
- Archdale Estate, Offer for Sale of, *Mar. 9,* 924.
- Arklow Postmaster, Appointment of, *Mar. 6,* 425.
- Currygranny Postal arrangements, *Mar. 1,* 28.
- Cusack Estate, Sale of, *Mar. 9,* 960.
- Derrycassan—Case of J. Jordan, *Mar. 9,* 926, 927.
- Dopping Hepenstall Estate, Negotiations as to Sale of, *Mar. 9,* 927, 928.
- Drumlish and Newtownforbes, purchase of, under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, proposed, *Mar. 14,* 1365.
- Edgeworthstown Post Office—Parcels delivery arrangements, *Mar. 1,* 28.
- Galbraith Estate, purchase of, by Commissioners—Applications from Tenants etc., *Mar. 9,* 961.
- Granard Telegraph Extension, Route of, *Mar. 9,* 938.
- Hanley, Private J., Case of, *Mar. 8,* 701.
- Irish Provident Assurance Society, Limited —Information as to, *Mar. 7,* 565.
- King-Harman Estate—Case of Mr. R. Armstrong, *Mar. 9,* 960.
- Land Act 1903.
  - Town holdings, purchase of, *Mar. 7,* 587.
  - Working of, *Mar. 9,* 958.
- Longford.
  - Constabulary Force, Strength of, *Mar. 14,* 1365.
  - Land Commission Sittings, Date of, *Mar. 13,* 1187.
    - Number of Fair Rent Appeals, Date of hearing, etc., *Mar. 9,* 924, 958, 959.
  - Postal Service to Elphin, Improvement of, *Mar. 9,* 940.
- O'Brien Estate, Sale of, *Mar. 2,* 189; *Mar 6,* 422, 423.
- Postmasters—Appointments to Vacancies in Ireland, *Mar. 9,* 940.
- Rathclive Grazing Farm, Purchase of, proposed, *Mar. 2,* 193.
- Rhodesia—Case of the late J. Murray, *Mar. 8,* 712.
- St. Mel's Cathedral, Preservation of, *Mar, 13,* 1192.
- Springtown—Reinstatement of T. Reilly *Mar. 8,* 722.
- Swine Fever Regulations in Ireland, *Mar. 6,* 411, 412.
- Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Sale of, *Mar. 2,* 193.
- Tonnemore Grazing Farm, Purchase of, proposed, *Mar. 7,* 587; *Mar. 9,* 961.

Fellows, Rt. Hon. A. E.—*President of the Board of Agriculture* [Hunts, Ramsey]
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3*, 360.
- Ireland—Swine Fever Outbreaks, Withdrawal of restrictions on movement of Swine, etc., *Mar. 2*, 197, 198; *Mar. 6*, 411, 412.
- Swine Fever Outbreaks, Improvement of Regulations as to, *Mar. 1*, 4.

Fenwick, Mr. C. [Northumberland, Wansbeck]
- Labour Statistics—Date of publication of Annual Abstract, *Mar. 9*, 922.
- Mines, Electricity in, New Rules for—Date of coming into force, *Mar. 9*, 921.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. Munro [Leith Burghs]
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 362.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
- Army—Staff, proposed changes in, *Mar. 2*, 212.
- Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, Referring to Standing Committee on Law, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1120.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
- Land Purchase Act, 1903, Transactions under, *Mar. 6*, 401.
- National School Teachers' Pension Fund, Administration of, *Mar. 6*, 402.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Education—Technical Instruction, Funds Available for, *Mar. 7*, 562.
- Gambling in Futures.
  - Foreign Countries' Legislation against, Information as to Working of, *Mar. 9*, 913.
  - Government proposals, *Mar. 7*, 556, 566.
- Gore-Booth Estate, Sale of—Exclusion of Ballymote, *Mar. 9*, 931
- Land Values, Taxation of, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 566.
- Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill, *Com.*, *Mar. 9*, 901.
- Peat bogs, Experiments as to Utilisation of, *Mar. 7*, 561.

Findlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney-General* [Inverness Burghs]
- Bankrupts, Undischarged, Company-promoting by, *Mar. 8*, 719.
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar 3*, 371.
- Hooley-Lawson Case—Reason for not Commencing Criminal proceedings against Mr. Hooley, *Mar. 8*, 720.
- Shipowner's Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 33[illegible]–337.

Findlay, Sir R. B.—*cont.*
- Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R., *Mar. 10*, 1098–1108.
- Trustees—Legislation to Prevent Fraud by, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 6.
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of.
  - Attorney-General, Responsibility of, for not Setting Public Prosecutor in Motion, *Mar. 9*, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1033.
  - Costs to be Defrayed by the Treasury—Supplementary Estimate for, *Mar. 9*, 1026, 1033.

First Commissioner of Works
- *Lord Windsor.*

First Lord of the Admiralty
- *Earl of Cawdor.*

First Lord of the Treasury
- *Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.*

Fire
- Protection from, date of appointing Committee to Consider
  - *Q.* Mr. Tennant; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 10*, 1051.

Fiscal Policy
- *Debates on Motion* [Mr. Churchill] *Mar. 8*, 805.
  - Agricultural Produce, proposed cut on, 809.
  - Chamberlain, Mr., proposals of, 809 816, 817.
    - Government Attitude towards, 820.
  - Colonial Conference, Subjects to be discussed at, 808, 821–824, 8[illegible]–828, 835–837, 841, 846, 848, 849.
  - Colonies, Preferential Treatment for, 816–818, 838, 839, 845.
    - Colonial Attitude, 807, 826, 827.
    - Commercial Bargains, System of, 818, 848, 849.
    - Government Attitude towards, 820, 821, 835, 841.
    - Monopoly, System of, 817.
  - Consolidating the Empire, Closer union with the Colonies, etc., 838, 839.
  - Corn Duty, Re-imposition of, 809, 822, 828.
  - Food, Taxation of, proposals as to, 807, 811, 812, 819, 821, 841, 842, 848, 849.
    - British food supply dependent on free imports, alleged, 811–813.
    - Definition of Protective Taxation on Food, 821, 829, 834.
  - Government policy, 840.
  - India.
    - Fiscal System of, 821, 822.

[*cont*

Fiscal Policy—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
India—*cont.*
Position of, under Colonial preference, 808, 809.
Meat, proposed duty on, 809.
Present Parliament, Question not to be raised during, 832, 833, 837.
Raw Material, Taxation of, 807.
Colonial Conference, Subjects to be discussed at.
Qs. Mr. Crombie, Mr. Soares, Mr. Bryce; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1227, 1228.
Colonies, Preferential Treatment for, Taxation of food, etc., *Motion* of Mr. Churchill, Government Attitude towards.
Qs. Mr. Soares; *A.* Sir A. Acland Hood, *Mar. 7,* 696.
General Election—Mandate to be asked of the country.
Qs. Mr. Black; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr, Speaker, *Mar. 7,* 593, 594.
Retaliation, Question of.
Qs. Marquess of Ripon, *Mar. 13,* 1161, 1162; Vis. Goschen, 1163; Marquess of Salisbury, 1164.

Fisheries, Board of
President—Earl of Onslow.

Fisheries
Boats—Tonnage measurement, Committee on—Deductions from gross measurement of Fishing Boats proposed.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 7,* 557.
Ireland.
Boats, Scheme for Insurance of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14,* 1384.
Sea and Coast Fisheries Fund—Account Presented, *Mar. 6,* 386, 389.
Protection of, by Gunboats — H.M.S. "Harrier" and "Barham," Information as to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 404.
Scotland.
Caithness and Sutherland, Inquiry into Depression of Fishing industry in—Date of Report.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 2,* 165.
Lewis, Island of.
Mansfield Commission, Inclusion in scope of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 13,* 1209.
Quantity of line-caught fish landed 1901–1904.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 13,* 1209.

Fisheries—*cont.*
Scotland—*cont.*
May, Isle of—Protection of Fisheries. Report by Lightkeepers of Illegal Trawling, etc.
Q. Captain Ellice; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 13,* 1188.
Trawling, *see that title.*

Flannery, Sir J. F. [Yorkshire, Shipley]
Navy.
Colonial Contributions towards cost of, *Mar. 13,* 1275.
Dockyards—Decentralisation Scheme, *Mar. 13,* 1274.
Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 13,* 1272.
Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 13,* 1274.
Oil Fuel, Adoption of, Sources of Supply, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1276.
Reserve, Increase in strength of, *Mar. 13,* 1274.
Shipbuilding—Designs, Committee on, Constitution and terms of Reference of, *Mar. 13,* 1275.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Distress in Ireland, Cause of, and Method of dealing with, *Mar. 14,* 1493.
Fair Rent Appeals in County Kerry, Date of Hearing, *Mar. 1,* 25.
Kerry County Council Audit, Result of *Mar. 2,* 191.
Swine Fever outbreaks, *Mar. 2,* 197, 198.
Trinity College Tenants, Committee Report as to, *Mar. 1,* 25.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Labourers, Condition of, Improvement in, Failure of Government to deal with, etc., *Mar. 1,* 108–110.
Land Act of 1903, Working of, Reports as to, etc., *Mar. 9,* 962.
Liscarroll Postal Arangements, Improvement in, *Mar. 14,* 1359.
MacDonnell, Sir A., Condition of Acceptance of Office by, *Mar. 9,* 943.
Mill Street—Land Commission Sittings, Date of, *Mar. 7,* 562.
Newman Estate, Sale of, Exclusion of Tenants, etc; *Mar. 9,* 964.
Thompson-Orpen Estate Evictions, Disturbances at, Action of Constabulary, etc., *Mar. 7,* 580.
Wright. Whittaker. Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney-General for not setting Public Prosecutor in Motion. *Mar, 9.* 1026. 1027,

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Marquess of Lansdowne,

Foreign Trawlers Regulation Bill
Date of Taking,
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour. *Mar. 13,* 1223, 1224.

Forestry
Colonial Forest Service Department. *and* Indian Forest Service Department. *see those titles,*

Foster, Sir B. W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
Army—London Recruiting Barracks. Removal of—Progress of Negotiations, *Mar. 10* 1053.
Post Office—Municipal Boroughs as Railway Sub-Offices *Mar. 14* 1361.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
South African War Stores and Supplies—Report of Comptroller and Auditor-General, *Mar. 14,* 1370.

France
Convention as to Newfoundland, Morocco, etc., *see names of countries.*
Navy—Information as to Vessels Built and Building—Return Ordered, *Mar. 6,* 391.
Public Works—Exclusion of Foreign-Made Material.
Q. Colonel Denny; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 1,* 15.

Fuller, Mr. J. M. F. [Wilts, Westbury]
Volunteers—Incidence of Grant, Changes proposed in, *Mar. 7,* 567.

Funded Debt
see under National Debt.

Galbraith Estate
Purchase of, by Commissioners—Applications from Tenants, etc.
O. Mr. J. P. Farrell, *Mar. 9,* 961.

Galway
Harbour, Proposals as to Dredging of, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Devlin; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 9,* 937, 938; *Mar. 13,* 1222, 1223.
Mill Stream, Clearing—Expenditure by Board of Works.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 14,* 1392.
Relief Works, Information as to.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1193.

Galway, Vis.
Education—Supply of Teachers, Grants for Pupil Teachers, etc., *Mar. 9,* 889.

Galway, W. T., Estate of,
Purchase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1177, 1178.

Gamble's Divorce Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 9,* 859

Gambling
Futures, in, Legislation to Restrict.
Foreign Countries, in, Information as to Working of.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 9,* 913.
Government Proposals.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 7,* 556, 557.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 7,* 566.

Gas Light and Coke, South Metropolitan, and Commercial Gas Companies Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 1.

Germany
Commercial Treaties, New, Provisions of—Preparation of Statement.
Q. Mr. Grenfell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 6,* 411.
Customs Tariff.
Statement as to, Presented, *Mar. 3,* 317; *Mar. 9,* 861.
Navy—Information as to Vessels Built and Building, etc., Return Ordered, *Mar. 6,* 391.
Sugar.
Freights on State Railways—Reduction of Rates.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1201.
Russia, Provisions of Treaty with.
Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1200, 1201.
Technical Instruction—Report Presented *Mar. 9,* 861.

Gibraltar
Dock and Harbour Works—East Side Harbour—Report of Admiral Rawson.
Q. Mr. Bill; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 14,* 1364, 1365.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork County, W.]
Ballylinch Signal Station, Date of Erection of, *Mar. 7,* 554.
Castletown Berehaven, Sitting of Sub-Land Commission at, proposed, *Mar. 1,* 7; *Mar. 6,* 413.
Clinton Estate—Admiralty Purchase of Land, *Mar. 1,* 10.
Watergrasshill Prosecution Case, *Mar. 1,* 19.
White Estate, Bantry—Person Employed to Inquire into Cases of Evicted Tenants, *Mar. 1,* 26.

Girls' Public Day School Company
Profits of, Grants Paid to, etc.
Qs. Sir G. Bartley; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 13,* 1208.

Glastrigan
Postal Arrangements, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. P. J. O'Brien; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8,* 701, 702.

Goddard, Mr. D. F. [Ipswich]
Post Office—Relatives of supervising officers, employment of, *Mar. 2,* 166.

Gordon, Major W. E. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3,* 338.
Somaliland Expedition, Conduct of—Policy of the Government as to administration of the country, etc, *Mar. 8,* 771–774.

Gordon, Mr. J. E. [Elgin and Nairn]
Land Purchase, Advances—Delay in transactions, *Mar. 9,* 965, 966.
Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, 2R., *Mar. 9,* 1012–1016.

Gore-Booth Estate
Sale of—Exclusion of town of Ballymote.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd, Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9, 931, 932.*
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1213.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. [Cambridge University]
Education.
Medical inspection of children in elementary schools and conditional payment of grants, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 398.
Underfed children, proposals as to, *Mar. 13,* 1184.
Physical Deterioration Committee, adoption of Recommendations and Report of, proposed, *Mar. 8,* 733.
Women, Employment of, before and after childbirth—Restrictions in foreign countries, *Mar. 6,* 395.

Goschen, Viscount
Fiscal Policy—Question of Retaliation. *Mar. 13,* 1163.
Indian Forest Service Department, transfer of, from Cooper's Hill to Oxford University, proposed, *Mar. 7,* 547–549.

Government Departments
Ex-soldiers, employment of.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1179.

Government Ships Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 1.* 30.

Granard
Telegraph extension, route of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9,* 938.

Granby, Marquess of
Military Manœuvres Bill, Com., *Mar. 9,* 875, 877, 882.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, N.]
School Attendance—Regulation as to residence outside local authority area, *Mar. 9,* 912.

Great Berkhampstead Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 6,* 389.

Great Central Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 3,* 297.

Great Central Railway (Pension Fund) Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 3,* 297.

Great Eastern Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 1.

Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 1.

Great Northern, Piccadilly and Brompton Railway Bill
c. 2R..* *Mar. 7,* 553.

Great Northern Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 1.

Great Western Railway (New Railways) Bill
c. 2.R.* *Mar. 1,* 1.

Grenfell, Mr. W. H. [Buckinghamshire] Wycombe]
German Commercial Treaties, New, Provisions of—Preparation of Statement, *Mar. 6,* 411.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. [Northumberland Berwick]
Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 366, 368.

Guest, Mr. I. C. [Plymouth]
Army Expenditure, Reduction in, Proposed, *Mar. 1,* 47.
Financial Position of the Country, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1,* 42–49.

Guiana, British
Demerara Garrison, Decision as to, Telegraphic Communication with West Indies, etc.
Q. Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Mr. Lyttleton, *Mar. 6,* 405, 406.

Gully, Rt. Hon. W. C. [Carlisle]
See Speaker.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B. [Haddington]
Navy.
Battleships of King Edward VII. type, Cost of, Number constructed etc., *Mar. 6,* 473.
Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar.* 6, 469.
Efficiency, Necessity for maintaining a High Standard of, *Mar. 6,* 471, 472.
Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 6,* 472, 475.
Guns. Calibre of, on Battleships, *Mar. 6,* 474.
Personnel. Reduction in Number of, *Mar. 6,* 472, 473.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Navy—*cont.*
  - Policy. Changes in, *Mar. 6*, 469–476.
  - Shipbuilding.
    - Programme 1905–6, *Mar, 6*, 473
    - Rate of, Acceleration in, Advantages of, etc., *Mar. 6*, 473.
  - Submarines, Value of. for offensive and defensive purposes, etc., *Mar, 6*, 473, 474.
  - Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Speed of, Information as to, *Mar. 6*, 474.

Halifax (Nova Scotia)
- British Garrison in, Withdrawal of, *see under* Canada—British Garrisons.

Halsbury, Earl of.—*Lord Chancellor.*
- Cabinet Meetings, Attendance at, of Minister, prior to taking Office and being sworn of the Privy Council, *Mar. 9*, 865.
- Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment Bill, 2R. *Mar. 13*, 1166.
- Naval Prize Bill, 2R, *Mar. 13*, 1167.
- Prevention of Corruption Bill, 2R, *Mar. 13*, 1164.
- Prize Courts Bill, 2R, *Mar. 13*, 1166.
- Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill, 2R, *Mar. 14*, 1353.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. [Middlesex, West Ealing]
- Admiralty—First Sea Lord, Changes in Office of, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1267.
- Fiscal Policy—Preferential treatment for Colonies, Food Taxation, etc., *Mar. 8*, 825–830.
- Meat, Inspection of—Establishing system of Branding or Certificate, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1050.
- Navy.
  - Bases, Defence of, Objections to placing in hands of Military authorities, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1270.
  - Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 13*, 1265.
  - Dockyards, Private and Government, Comparative Cost of Repairs in, *Mar. 13*, 1268, 1269.
  - Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 13*, 1264.
  - Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, proposals as to, *Mar. 13*, 1235, 1236, 1266.
  - Police Duties of the Fleet, *Mar. 13*, 1265.
  - Shipbuilding—Designs, Committee on, Constitution and Terms of Reference of, *Mar. 13*, 1266.
- Parliamentary Procedure — Previous Question used in connection with a Motion made by Private Member, *Mar. 8*, 825.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Africa. South—Appointment of Lord Selborne as High Commissioner, *Mar. 6*, 492, 493.
- Education—Free Meals for Underfed Children, *Mar. 8*, 731, 732.
- Emigration—Poor Law Officers, powers of, to assist Destitute Persons to Emigrate, *Mar. 2*, 184.
- Financial Position of the Country. Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1*, 94–96.
- Transvaal—Chinese Labour—Secret Societies and Trade Unions, Regulations as to forming, *Mar. 1*, 13; *Mar. 6*, 406.
- Unemployed. Legislation for, Date of Introduction of, *Mar. 6*, 430.
- Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, Referring to Standing Committee on Law, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1121.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
- Caithness and Sutherland Fishing Industry, Inquiry into Depression of—Date of Report, *Mar. 2*, 165.
- Post Office Mail Service to the North of Scotland, *Mar. 2*, 165.

"Harrier," H.M.S.
- Speed and Fishery Duties of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 404.

Harrington, Mr. T. [Dublin Harbour]
- Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvements Bill, 2R, *Mar. 9*, 1014, 1017–1019, 1020.

Harris, Lord
- Education—Supply of Teachers, Grants for Pupil Teachers, etc., *Mar. 9*, 895, 897.

Hastings Tramways Bill
- *l.* 2R,* *Mar. 13*, 1130.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Prisons — Hair-cutting Regulations for Prisoners under remand, *Mar. 6*, 398.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
- Athlone—Curramore Bog Purchased by War Office—Payment of Awards, *Mar. 9*, 940, 941.
- De Freyne Estate, Progress of Negotiations for Sale of, *Mar. 2*, 196; *Mar. 6*, 420; *Mar. 9*, 935.
- Distress in West of Ireland, Cause of, and Method of Dealing with, *Mar. 14*, 1462.
- King-Harman Estate, Sale of, *Mar. 7*, 584.
- Land Purchase Act, 1903—Purchase of Town Holdings, *Mar. 7*, 587, 588.

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D. [Walsall]
- Army.
  - Civilians Attached to Units, Pay of, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2*, 289.
  - Deferred Pay, Information as to, *Mar. 2*, 217.

[*cont.*

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.—*cont.*
Army—*cont.*
Malta Garrison, Reduction in, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 217.
Nine Years' Service System, proposals as to, *Mar. 2*, 217.
Regimental Allowances and Expenses, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2*, 281.
Reserve.
Estimate for, *Mar. 2*, 217.
Nine Years' Service System, Effect of, on the Reserve, *Mar. 7*, 631, 635.
Staff, Increase in Expenditure for, *Mar.* 217.
South African Garrison—Sale of Stores, *Mar. 2*, 218, 219.
Kuklish, Salonica, Alleged Outrage by Turkish Troops at, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1173.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Nurses, Society for the Higher Education of, Grant of Licence for, *Mar. 13*, 1202.

Heckmondwike Improvement Bill
c. 1R*, *Mar. 2*, 162.
2R*, *Mar. 7*, 553.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, N.]
Education—National School Teachers, Grievances of—Strabane Teachers' Resolution, *Mar. 1*, 21.
Land Act of 1903, Working of, *Mar. 9*, 966–968.
Newtown Stewart Labourers' Cottage Scheme, Decision as to, *Mar. 8*, 704.

Higham and Hundred of Hoo Water Bill
c. 2R*, *Mar. 1*, 1.

Highland Railway Bill
c. 2R*, *Mar. 8*, 697.

Hitchin and District Gas Bill
c. 2R,* *Mar. 6*, 389.

Hoare, Sir S. [Norwich]
Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill, *Com.*, *Mar. 13*, 1169.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. [Bristol, E.]
Army.
Guns, Proportion of, to Sabres, etc., *Mar. 3*, 323.
Reorganisation Proposals, *Mar. 2*, 229.
Staff, Proposed Changes in, *Mar. 2*, 232.
Army Estimates, Date of Taking, *Mar. 9*, 946.
Bristol, Telegraph Superintendentship, Appointment to, *Mar. 9*, 910.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E.—*cont.*
Broughton Gifford School, Building Grant to, *Mar. 3*, 318.
Somaliland Expedition.
Conduct of—Future Administration of the Country, etc., *Mar. 7*, 645–651.
Stores for, Resale of, to India, *Mar. 2*, 220.
Whitchurch (Glos.) Rifle Range—Cost etc., *Mar. 9*, 918, 919.

Holyhead
Fishermen, Disaster to—Assistance to Families.
Q. Mr. O. Williams; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 8*, 717.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. A. A. Douglas
Under-Secretary—Mr. T. H. Cochrane.

Honduras, British
Garrison, Decision as to, Telegraphic Communication with West Indies, etc.
Q. Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 6*, 405, 406.

Hooley-Lawson Case
Hooley Mr., Reason for not Commencing Criminal Proceedings against.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar. 8*, 719, 720.

Hope, Mr. J. F. [Sheffield, Brightside]
Minister of the Crown Acting as Chairman, Precedents for, *Mar. 2*, 262.
Navy.
Battleships—Re-armouring of Ships of "Canopus" "Majestic" and "Royal Sovereign" Classes, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1405.
Dockyards, Repairs in, Comparative Cost of, in Private and Government Yards, *Mar. 14*, 1405.

Hope, Bradwell & Castleton Light Railway Order 1905
Presented, *Mar. 8*, 699; *Mar. 9*, 862.

Horses
Epizootic Lymphangitis—Waterford Outbreak.
Os. Mr. Power, *Mar. 8*, 786.
Compensation for Destruction of Horses.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1219.

Howard, Mr. Joseph [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Old Age Pensions—Scheme of Mr. Cottew, *Mar. 2*, 169.

Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Railway and Dock Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1*, 1.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Navy, Flogging in, *Mar. 14*, 1442.

Hyde Park
Rotten Row, Repair of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Mar. 13*, 1172.

Hylton, Lord
Military Manœuvres Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2*, 158.

Ibadan
see under Africa, West.

Income Tax
Returns, Regulations as to Preserving Secrecy of.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 13*, 1174, 1175.

India Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. W. St. John Broderick.
Under-Secretary—Marquess of Bath.

India
Affairs of, Opportunity for Discussion of.
Qs. Mr. Smith, Mr. J. H. Lewis; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 7*, 595.

Army.

Drafts for—Condition of Men sent Out.
O. Captain Norton *Mar. 2*, 238.

Expenditure Increase in.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 2*, 172, 173.
Q. Mr. Cremer; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 919.

Reserve for, Arrangements as to.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 7*, 637; Mr. Churchill, 437; Mr. Arnold Forster, 637; Captain Norton, 638; Mr. O'Mara, 639, 640.

Terms of Service.
O. Mr. B. Davenport, *Mar. 2*, 210.

Bombay—University Provisional Syndicate

Rules for Election of.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 914, 915.

Budget.

Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 2*, 171.

Military Services, Increase of Expenditure under.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 2*, 172, 173.
Q. Mr. Cremer; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 919.

Crops, Damage to, by Frost—Provision against Distress, etc.
Q. Mr. D. Morgan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 1*, 7, 8.

Forest Service, *see title* Indian Forest Service.

India—*cont.*

Imperator *v.* A. C. Rolt, Case of, Presentation of Report, proposed.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 13*, 1192.

Import Duties in.

Debate [Lords], *Mar. 13*, 1131.

Articles exempted from Duty, 1135.

Colonial Conference, Representation of India at, 1150, 1153, 1158.

Convention with France, Ratification of, etc., 1148, 1159, 1164.

Countervailing Duties on bounty-fed Sugar, Policy of, 1139, 1147, 1151.

Export Duties, Question of Retaliation by means of, 1149, 1150, 1157.

French Market, Extension of Most-favoured Nation Treatment to Indian Goods in, 1132, 1138, 1145, 1146, 1156.

Indian Products admitted by Continental Nations on a lower Tariff than corresponding British Products, 1132, 1141, 1145, 1156.

Nature of Import and Export Trade, 1144, 1149, 1153.

Powers of Executive Government as to, 1142, 1143, 1147, 1152, 1155, 1156, 1160.

Retaliation, Question of, 1136, 1137, 1140, 1144, 1148, 1149.

Taxation of Imports, Policy of, 1132–1135.

Tea, Russian Retaliatory Duty on, 1139, 1144, 1145, 1149.

Petitions for Redress of Grievances Presented in Parliament, Action taken on—Publication of Report of Select Committee in Indian Papers, etc., 913, 914.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 9*, 913, 914.

Police, Commission on—Adoption of Report and Recommendations.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar. 6*, 407.

Indian Forest Service Department
Transfer of, from Cooper's Hill, to University of Oxford, proposed.
Os. Earl of Lytton, *Mar. 7*, 532–538, 549–552; Lord Thring, 538; Marquess of Bath, 538–544; Earl Spencer, 544, 545; Marquess of Lansdowne, 546, 547; Viscount Goschen, 547–549; Bishop of Bristol, 549.

Alternative Proposals.
Os. Earl of Lytton, *Mar. 7*, 535, 536; Marquess of Bath, 542,

[*cont.*

Indian Forest Service Department—*cont.*
Transfer of—*cont.*
Endowment, Arrangements as to.
Os. Marquess of Bath, *Mar.* *7*, 542, 543; Marquess of Lansdowne, 547.
Exclusion of other Universities, Objections to.
Os. Earl of Lytton, *Mar.* *7*, 533, 535, 549, 550; Marquess of Bute, 541; Earl Spencer, 544, 545; Marquess of Lansdowne, 547.
Experimental term, Reduction in.
Os. Marquess of Bath, *Mar.* *7*, 543; Earl Spencer, 545.

Inland Revenue
Collectors' Offices, Clerks in—Pay for Extra Duty.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar.* *7*, 572, 573.
Estate Duty, *see that title.*

Inny
Peat Production Experiments, Result of.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *7*, 561.

Inverpolly
Postal Facilities at, Extension of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar.* *13*, 1207.

Ireland
Lord Lieutenant—Earl of Dudley.
Chief Secretary—Right hon. W. H. Long.
Lord Chancellor—Lord Ashbourne.
Attorney-General—Right hon. J. Atkinson.
[*For particular places, see their names.*]
Administration.
Chief Secretary.
Appointment, Date of.
Os. Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Sir A. Acland-Hood, *Mar.* *9*, 1039.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* *9*, 942.
Method of appointing, Tenure of Office, etc.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* *2*, 199, 200.
Wyndham, Mr., Resignation of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* *6*, 431; Mr. Runciman, Sir A. Acland-Hood, 528; Mr. W. Churchill, Sir A. Acland-Hood, *Mar.* *9*, 1039, 1040.
Q. Mr. Churchill; *A.* Sir A. Acland-Hood, *Mar.* *2*, 295, 296.
Q. Earl of Rosebery; *A.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *Mar.* *6*, 387.

Ireland—*cont.*
Administration—*cont.*
Executive Government, Official responsible for.
O. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Mar.* *9*, 942.
Lord-Lieutenant, Rumour as to Resignation of.
O. Mr. M'Kenna, *Mar.* *6*, 528.
Q. Mr. W. Churchill; *A.* Sir Acland-Hood, *Mar.* *2*, 295, 296.
MacDonnell, Sir A. *see that subheading.*
"Albert," Removal of Wreck of, Payment of Compensation to Fishermen, etc.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar.* *6*, 396.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar.* *13*, 1189.
Bankruptcy Return Presented, *Mar.* *2*, 164; *Mar.* *3*, 298.
Beet Cultivation, Encouragement of.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar* *9*, 932
Butter—Delay in Transit, Prevention of
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *14*, 1388.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *Mar.* *14*, 1392, 1393.
Chief Secretary, *see under subheading* Administration.
Church Temporalities—Report and Account Presented, *Mar.* *6*, 386, 391.
County and District Council Elections, Persons qualified to act as Presiding Officers at.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *13*, 1212, 1213.
Dispensary Districts, Amalgamation of—Ardee Inquiry Decision.
Qs. Mr. Nolan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson *Mar.* *2*, 189, 190.
Distress in.
Cause of, and Method of Dealing with.
Os. Mr. Hayden, *Mar.* *14*, 1462; Mr. J. Redmond, 1468; Mr. O'Malley, 1478; Mr. Atkinson, 1483; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1490; Mr. Jas. Campbell, 1492; Mr. Flavin, 1493.
Relief Works, Particulars of.
Q. Mr. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *14*, 1391.
Drainage Schemes, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *2*, 194.
Fisheries, *see that title*—Ireland.
Forestry, Development of.
Qs. Mr. Farrell, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *1*, 20, 21.
Franciscan Manuscripts, Progress made with Printing.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar.* *6*, 395.
Gun Licenses—Murphy, Mr. J., Refusal of License to.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *1*, 8, 9.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Irish Language, *see that title.*
Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Scheme.
Progress made with.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 187, 188.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 930
Roads, Repair and Maintenance of, Provision of Funds for, etc.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 929, 930.
Jurors Laws, Amendment of, proposed. *Q.* Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14*, 1388, 1389.
Law Courts, *see that title.*
Loan Fund Board—Annual Report Presented, *Mar. 8*, 698; *Mar. 9*, 861.
MacDonnell, Sir A.
Censure of, by the Cabinet.
Correspondence with Chief Secretary, Cognisance of, by Members of Cabinet.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1224.
Explanation of Actions, Opportunity Afforded for.
Qs Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 425, 426.
Conditions of Acceptance of Office by.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Labouchere; *As.* Mr. A. J Balfour; *Mar. 9*, 941, 942.
Qs. Mr. J. Morley, Mr. T. W Russell, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr Sloan: *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1224–1227.
Communication of, by Prime Minister, to his colleagues.
Qs. Mr. J. Ellis, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Blake, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Labouchere; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 9*, 943, 944.
Retention of Services of, as Under-Secretary.
Q Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 9*, 941.
Peat Bogs, Utilisation of—Result of Experiments, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Atkinson. *Mar. 7*, 561.
Pharmaceutical Society, Refusal of, to Register Limerick Technical Classes, alleged.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14*, 1391.
Police, *see* Constabulary, Royal Irish *and* Dublin—Metropolitan Police,

Ireland—*cont.*
Potatoes, Seed, Free Distribution of, in distressed districts, proposed.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 14*, 1358.
Prisons, *see under that title.*
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, *see under that title.*
Representative Peers for, *see under* Parliamentary—House of Lords.
Roman Catholic University Question, Government Attitude towards.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 418.
Swine Fever, *see that title*—Ireland.
Traction Engines, Damage done to roads by—Application of Highways and Locomotives Act, etc.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 8*, 723.
Trinity College, *see that title.*
United Irish League, Outrage by, at Dingle alleged.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Atkinkinson, *Mar. 1*, 23, 24.
Urban District Council Special Meetings Provision for Summoning, *Mar. 2*, 174.

Irish Language
Letters and Parcels Addressed in, Post Office Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 6*, 423–425.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 7*, 590, 591.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 729, 730.
Error in Address of Letter to Kilronan, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 939.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. W. Moore; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1220, 1221.
Schools, Teaching in—Proposals as to Teaching in London.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 7*, 578.

Irish Provident Assurance Society Ltd.
Information as to—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 565.

Italy
Navy—Information as to Vessels Built and Building—Return ordered, *Mar. 6*, 391.

Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Scheme
See under Ireland.

James of Hereford, Lord
Street Betting Bill, Com. and *Rep.*, *Mar. 2*, 159–161.

Japan
British Military Officers—Applications and Appointments for Residence and Study.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Master of Elibank; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2*, 178, 179.
Navy—Information as to Vessels Built and Building—Return ordered, *Mar. 6*, 391.

Jeffreys, Mr. A. F. [Hants., N.]
Navy Estimates—Vote A, Discussion of Whole Naval Policy on, *Mar. 13*, 1322–1324.

Jevers, Mr. R., Estate of
Sale of, in Land Judge's Court—Amount offered, etc.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 925, 926.

Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District]
Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 332–336.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Butter, Delay in Transit of, and Delay in Dealing with Complaint, etc., *Mar. 14*, 1388, 1392.
Limerick.
Post and Telegraph Offices—Rutland Street Vacancy, Appointment to, Extension of Telegraph to William Street, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1186.
School, Knitting Instruction at—Report of Miss Anderson, *Mar. 7*, 589.
Technical Classes, Refusal of Pharmaceutical Society to Register, alleged, *Mar. 14*, 1391.
Swine Fever Regulations in Ireland, *Mar. 6*, 411.

Juvenile Smoking Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 14*, 1398.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
Navy.
Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 6*, 462.
Dockyards.
Administration of.
Committee on, Constitution of, *Mar. 13*, 1261.
Reforms in, *Mar. 6*, 482, 483; *Mar. 13*, 1261.
Repairs, Comparative Cost of, in Private and Government Yards, *Mar. 13*, 1260.
Gunnery—Night Firing, Arrangements for Practice in, *Mar. 6*, 481.
Gun-sights, Improvement in, *Mar. 6*, 482.
Inspector of Target Practice for the Fleet, Duties and Emoluments of, etc., *Mar. 6*, 481.

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 6*, 462. *Mar. 13*, 1261.
Officers, Compulsory Retirement of—Reduction of Age, *Mar. 2*, 169.
Repairs—Ships to be struck off Effective List, Estimate for Repairs to, *Mar. 13*, 1262.
Torpedo Boats, Design and Speed of, *Mar. 13*, 1262–1264.
Sugar, Comparative Prices of, 1902–1905, *Mar. 8*, 719.

Kenmare
Cottar, Case of—Inquiry into Charges against Rev. Mr. Duggan, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 928, 929; *Mar. 14*, 1390, 1391.

Kennedy, Mr. P. J. [Westmeath, N.]
Urban District Council Special Meetings, Provision for Summoning, *Mar. 2*, 174.

Kennedy, Mr. Vincent P. [Cavan, W.]
Belturbet Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Mar. 13*, 1219.
Milltown, Sunday post to, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 911.
Cavan Magistrates, Appointment of, *Mar. 2*, 192.
Savings Bank, Post Office—Inspection of Depositors' Accounts, Powers of Registrar of Friendly Societies, etc., *Mar. 8*, 715; *Mar. 13*, 1205.

Kensington Gardens
Roads in, Continuation of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Partington; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Mar. 1*, 7.

Kenyon, Lord
Vaccination of Children of School Age, Legislation as to, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1044.

Kenyon-Slaney Rt. Hon. Col. W. [Shropshire, Newport]
Russo-Japanese War, Lessons of—British Officers Attached to Belligerent Forces, *Mar. 2*, 210–212.

Kerry
County Council Audit.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 400.
Qs. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 190, 191.
Evictions and Reinstatements in.
O. Mr Murphy, *Mar. 9*, 983, 984.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 414.
Fair Rent Appeals, date of Hearing.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1*, 25.

Keswick, Mr. W. [Surrey, Epsom]
  Motors, Heavy, Compensation for Damage done by, *Mar. 1*, 6.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
  Clare Fair Rent Appeals—Dissatisfaction with Reductions, Alleged, *Mar. 9*, 937; *Mar. 13*, 1217, 1218.
  Constabulary, Royal Irish—Rasharkin, Transfers of Force at, *Mar. 2*, 193, 194.
  Drainage Schemes, Information as to, *Mar. 2*, 194.
  Eviction Reinstatements.
    Compensation to Present owners who have Purchased Holdings, *Mar. 2*, 195; *Mar. 9*, 998.
    Progress made with, *Mar. 9*, 996.
  Forestry, Development of, *Mar. 1*, 21.
  Land Act, 1903.
    Estates Commissioners, Instructions and Regulations Issued to—Tabling, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 999, 1000.
    Towns and Villages, Purchase of, *Mar. 6*, 418.
  Land Commission—Fair Rent Appeals—First Term Rents, Action of Commissioners in Raising, *Mar. 9*, 997.
  Longworth Estate—Disposal of Lands, *Mar. 9*, 929.
  Newry—case of H. J. Livingstone, *Mar. 9*, 936.
  Spirits, Foreign duty paid—Removals in United Kingdom, Check on Statements by Spirit Dealers, etc., *Mar. 2*, 185.
  Springtown—Reinstatement of T. Reilly, *Mar. 8*, 722.
  Whiskey Age Guarantee—Canadian Practice, *Mar. 6*, 408.

Kildalkey
  Constabulary Barracks, Memorial against Disestablishment of, etc.
    Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1177.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
  China, North, Barrack Accommodation for British Troops in, *Mar. 13*, 1175.
  Tibet Expedition Rewards—Omission of Transport Officers, Alleged, *Mar. 9*. 915.

King's Speech on the opening of Parliament
  Address in Answer.
    Debates, *Mar. 1*. 30.
    Message from the King, *Mar. 6*, 388.

King-Harman Estate
  Armstrong, Mr. R., Claim of, for reinstatement, etc.
    O. Mr. Farrell, *Mar. 9*, 960.
  Sale of.
    Boyle, Inclusion of.
      Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1213.

King-Harman Estate—*cont.*
  Sale of—*cont.*
    Excluded portions.
      Qs. Mr. James O'Kelly, Mr. Hayden; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 583, 584.

Kingston Estate
  Sale of—Division of Land, Number of Agreements to Purchase, etc.
    Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 907, 908.

Knowles, Sir L. [Salford, W.]
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Revenue and Expenditure of, 1890–1904, *Mar. 9*, 904.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]
  Africa, South, Garrison in, Constabulary Duty done by, alleged, *Mar. 2*, 254.
  Armaments, Increase in Expenditure on, *Mar. 14*, 1425–1427.
  Army Reserve, Vote for, Reduction of, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 641.
  MacDonnell, Sir A., Conditions of Acceptance of Office by, *Mar. 9*, 942, 944.
  Navy.
    Personnel, Reduction in Number of, *Mar. 14*, 1424.
    Police Duties of the Fleet, *Mar. 14*, 1425.
  Somaliland Expedition, Conduct of—Policy of the Government as to Future Administration, etc., *Mar. 8*, 768–771.
  Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14*, 1509.
  Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of.
    Attorney-General, Responsibility of, for not Setting Public Prosecutor in Motion, *Mar. 9*, 1028.
    Costs to be defrayed by the Treasury—Supplementary Estimate for, *Mar. 9*, 1028.

Labour
  Board of Trade Statistics, Annual Abstract of—Date of Publication.
    Q. Mr. Fenwick; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 9*, 922.

Labourers (Ireland)
  Advances to, High Rate of Interest Charged.
    Os. Mr. C. Craig, *Mar. 1*, 112, 113; Mr. Lundon, 117, 118; Mr. Atkinson, 122, 123.
  Condition of, Improvement in, Failure of Government to deal with.
    Os. Capt. Donelan, *Mar. 1*, 101, 102; Mr. Cullinan, 103–106; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 107; Mr. Flynn, 108–110; Mr. C. Craig, 110–113; Mr. O'Shaughnessy, 113–116; Mr. Lundon, 116–118; Mr. Sloan, 118–120; Mr. Atkinson, 120–124; Mr. J. Redmond, 124–126.
  Gratuities to, Amount of.
    Os. Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Sloan, *Mar. 1*, 123.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts

Administration of, Amendment of Code, etc.
Os. Mr. C. Craig, *Mar. 1,* 112; Mr. O'Shaughnessy, 115; Mr. Atkinson, 124; Mr. J. Redmond, 126.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill, 1904

Terms of, Opposition of the Government to, and Abandonment of Bill.
Os. Capt. Donelan, *Mar. 1,* 101, 102; Mr. Cullinan, 103, 104; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 107; Mr. Flynn, 109; Mr. C. Craig, 111, 112; Mr. O'Shaughnessy, 114; Mr. Lundon, 116; Mr. Sloar, 119; Mr. Atkinson, 121, 122.

Labourers' Cottages (Ireland)

Schemes.
For particular places see their names.
Cumbersome and Costly Procedure under Act.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *Mar. 1,* 105; Mr. C. Craig, 113; Mr. O'Shaughnessy, 115; Mr. Lundon, 116; Mr. Atkinson, 124; Mr. J. Redmond, 126.
Progress made with.
Os. Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 123; Mr. J. Redmond, 126.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 909.

Lagos

Government Inscribed Stock, Security for.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 13,* 1182.

Labour for Congo Free State, Government warning against.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8,* 713.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]

Africa, South, Land Settlement in—Acreage Required, Cost of Land, Number of Settlers, etc., *Mar. 7,* 570.

Army.
Pay—Infantry, *Mar. 13,* 1197.
Maximum of Privates, *Mar. 14,* 1367.
Re-organisation—Policy of Army Council, *Mar. 7,* 568.

Army Estimates, Causes of Increase in, *Mar. 14,* 1367.

Tibet Expedition—Treaty.
China, Adhesion of, and Appointment of Plenipotentiary, *Mar. 7,* 570.
Indemnity, Amount of—Period Allowed for Payment, *Mar. 7,* 570.

Volunteers, Grants to, Changes proposed in, *Mar. 14,* 1367.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]

Crofters Act, 1886, Legislation for Extension of, to Buteshire, proposed, *Mar. 13,* 1223.

Lancaster, Duchy of

Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. Walrond

Land Act (Ireland), 1903

Applications for Loans under, Number and Amounts of.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *Mar. 1,* 104; Mr. J. Gordon, *Mar. 9,* 965, 966; Mr. Hemphill, 967, 968; Sir J. Colomb, 985.

Estates Commissioners.
Administration by, Alterations in Policy, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1212.
Advances to Evicted Tenants, Powers as to.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 975; Mr. Kilbride, 998.
Instructions and Regulations Issued to—Tabling, proposed.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *Mar. 9,* 952, 953, 958; Mr. Hemphill, 966, 967; Mr. Atkinson, 976–982; Mr. J. Redmond, 979, 980; Mr. Murphy, 982; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 991–996; Mr. Kilbride, 999, 1000.
Report of Proceedings, Date of Issue of, etc.
Os. Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 971, 972.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 585.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 13,* 1222.
Section 5 of the Act, Interpretation and Administration of.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *Mar. 9,* 955, 972; Mr. Atkinson, 972–974; Mr. J. Redmond, 973.
Status of, Administrative Functions etc.
Os. Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 976–982; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 991–996.

Evicted Tenants, Re-instatement of, *see under* Evictions.

Inspectors, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Delany, Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 21.

Landlords, Breakdown of the Act due to, alleged.
Os. Mr. J. P. Farrell, *Mar. 9,* 958, 959; Mr. Flynn, 962, 963.

Stock, Issue of—Loss Involved by Repayment at Par.
Qs. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1,* 16.

[*cont.*

Land Act (Ireland) 1903—*cont.*
Town Holdings, Purchase of.
Qs. Mr. Farrell, Mr. Hayden; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 7, 587, 588.
Towns and Villages, Purchase of
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 6, 417, 418.
Transactions under.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Atkinson *Mar.* 6, 401.
Working of.
Failure of, Alleged.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Mar.* 14, 1470; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1491.
Reports as to, Furnishing.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Mar.* 7, 669, 670; Mr. Atkinson, 672–679; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 686; Mr. T. W. Russell, 688.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *Mar.* 9, 949; Mr. T. W. Russell, 953–956; Mr. Flynn, 962; Mr. Hemphill, 966–968.

Land Commission, Ireland
[*For particular places, see their names.*]
Commissioners.
Staff, proposed Increase in, Information as to.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *Mar.* 9, 949; Mr. Atkinson, 970; Sir J. Colomb, 985; Mr. Delany, 986.
Work of, Unsatisfactory Nature of, Delays, etc.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *Mar.* 9, 948–950.
Evicted Tenants, *see under* Evictions.
Fair Rent Appeals.
Breakdown of Machinery under Act of 1903, alleged.
Os. Mr. J. P. Farrell, *Mar.* 9, 958, 959.
Courts, Selection of Places for Holding, Studying Convenience of Farmers, etc.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *Mar.* 9, 951; Mr. Flynn, 963, 964; Mr. Atkinson, 969.
Delay in Hearing.
Os. Mr. Hemphill, *Mar.* 9, 967; Mr. Atkinson, 969; Mr. Murphy, 983.
First Term Rents, Action of Commissioners in Raising.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *Mar.* 9, 951; Mr. Atkinson, 969; Mr. Kilbride, 997.
Office of.
Accommodation in, Sanitary Condition of, etc.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *Mar.* 9, 957; Mr. Hemphill, 967.

Land Commission, Ireland—*cont.*
Office of—*cont.*
Salaries and Expenses of, Vote for, *Mar.* 9, 947.
Work of, Date of Issuing Report as to.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *Mar.* 9, 954; Mr. Atkinson, 968.

Land Purchase, Ireland
[*For particular places, see their names.*]
Advances, Delay in Placing Loans, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Gordon, *Mar* 9, 965, 966; Mr. Hemphill, 967, 968; Mr. Atkinson, 970, 971; Mr. T. W. Russell, 971; Sir J. Colomb, 985.
Zone System, Abuse of—Steps taken to Safeguard Interests of Tenants, etc.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *Mar.* 9, 951, 952; Mr. T. W. Russell, 954.

Land Values
Taxation of, in London, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* 7, 566.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.*
Cabinet Meetings, Attendance of Minister at, Prior to taking Office and being sworn of the Privy Council, *Mar.* 9, 864.
India—Import Duties, *Mar.* 13, 1154–1158.
Indian Forest Service Department, Transfer of, from Cooper's Hill to Oxford University, *Mar.* 7, 546, 547.
Ireland—Resignation of Mr. Wyndham, *Mar.* 6, 387.
Military Manœuvres Bill, 2R., *Mar.* 2, 158; *Com.*, *Mar.* 9, 880–882, 885.

Larkhill
School Accommodation for Roman Catholic Children at.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 3, 321, 322.

Laurie, Lt. Gen. J. W. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest].
Army.
Artillery Officers—Regulations as to Appointment to Royal Horse Artillery after five Years' Service, *Mar.* 13, 1180.
Barracks Department, Discharge of Employees from, *Mar.* 13, 1178.
Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister—Legalisation of Colonial Marriages in United Kingdom, *Mar.* 13, 1182.
Navy.
North American Squadron—Residence of Commander-in-Chief, *Mar.* 14, 1403.
Pacific, British Position in, *Mar.* 14, 1401, 1402.

[*cont.*

Laurie Lt. Gen. J. W.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Police Duties of the Fleet, *Mar. 14*, 1401.
Stations at Halifax and Esquimault handed over to Canadian Government, *Mar. 13*, 1258; *Mar. 14*, 1402, 1403.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Butter, Irish, Prevention of Delay in Transit of, *Mar. 14*, 1393.
Railways.
Accidents in 1904, Date of Presenting Return, etc., *Mar. 14*, 1364.
Electric, North Eastern, Accidents on, etc., *Mar. 14*, 1379.

Law, Mr. H. A. (Donegal, W.)
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Instructors, Regulations as to Allocation of, *Mar. 14*, 1386, 1387.
Tuberkeen—Reinstatement of Mr. G. Ward, *Mar. 14*, 1387.
Turkey—Customs Duties, Increase in—Application of Surplus to carrying out Reforms in Macedonia, *Mar. 14*, 1375.

Law Courts
Ireland.
Evidence of accused Persons, Law as to.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 421.
Supreme Court of Judicature.
Return Presented, *Mar. 6*, 390.

Lawrence, Mr. W. F. [Liverpool, Abercrombie]
Education—Training Colleges, Accommodation for Women Students at, *Mar. 14*, 1363.
West Indies—Garrisons, Decision as to Telegraphic Communication between Stations, etc., *Mar. 6*, 405.

Lawson, Mr. J. G. [Yorkshire, North Riding Thirsk]
Poor Law Medical Officers—Regulations as to extra Appointments, *Mar. 13*, 1190.
Unemployed—London Committee, Grant from Imperial Exchequer to, Suggested, *Mar. 13*, 1174.

Lee, Mr. A. H.—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Hampshire, Fareham]
Ballylinch Signal Station, Date of Erection of, *Mar. 7*, 554.
Gibraltar Dock Works, East Side—Report of Admiral Rawson, *Mar. 14*, 1365.
Wei-hai-wei, Works at, Progress of, *Mar. 6*, 526.
Whale Island—Date of Completion of Accommodation for Officers, *Mar. 14*, 1368.
Works, Loan Expenditure on, *Mar. 13*, 1172.
Works Acts, Expenditure under, *Mar. 6*, 405.
Works Bill.
Date of Introduction of, *Mar. 6*, 404.
Details of, Information as to, *Mar 6*, 525

Lees, Sir E. (Birkenhead)
Navy
Command of the Sea a vital Necessity to Great Britain, *Mar 14*, 1427, 1428
Duties of, *Mar 14*, 1427

Leese, Sir J. F. (Lancashire, Accrington)
Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill 2R. *Mar. 3*, 363.

Leeward Islands
Trade Report Presented, *Mar. 3*, 298, 317.

Legge, Col. H. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
Army Pay, Deferred, Amount of, *Mar. 2*, 262, 263.
Mall to Charing Cross—Victoria Memorial.
Position of Pillars, *Mar. 2*, 186.
Progress made with, *Mar. 14*, 1380.

Lerwick
German Fleet, Visit of.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *Mar. 6*, 520.

Lewis, Island of
Fisheries, Line.
Mansfield Commission, Inclusion in Scope of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S Dickson, *Mar. 13*, 1209
Quantity Landed during 1901–1904.
Q. Mr. Weir; Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 13*, 1209.
Health Officer for, Appointment of, etc.,
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 14*, 1384.
Ness Harbour—Clearing of sand, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 14*, 1383.
Postal Arrangements, Improvements in.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1377, 1378.
Shader Landing Place, Work at, Delay in proceeding with.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 7*, 579.

Lewis, Mr. J. H. [Flint Boroughs]
India, Affairs of, Opportunity for discussion of, *Mar. 7*, 595.
Strangers' Gallery, Regulations as to admittance to, *Mar. 10*, 1128.
Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney Gerneral for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9*, 1026.

Lewis Estate
Evicted Tenants, re-instatement of—Number of Applications, Number of Reinstatements, etc.
Os. Mr. Roche, *Mar. 7*, 661; Mr. Duffy, 691.

Licences
Gun—Ireland, *see under* **Ireland.**

Light Railways Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 2.* 205.

Limerick
Post and Telegraph Offices.
Rutland Street Vacancy, Appointment to.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13,* 1186, 1187.
William Street, Telegraph Extension to.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13,* 1186, 1187.
School—Knitting, Report on.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 589, 590.
Technical Classes. Refusal of Pharmaceutical Society to Register, Alleged.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14,* 1391.

Liscarroll
Postal Arrangements, Improvement in.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14,* 1359.

Lisnaskea
Petty Sessions—Children sent to Monaghan Female Industrial School.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 564.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon, &c.]
Africa, South, Garrison in—Constabulary duty done by, Alleged, *Mar. 2,* 252.
Business of the House—Motion to report Progress, *Mar. 2,* 271.
Parliamentary Procedure—Member called upon by the Speaker to move the Order of the Day—Motion "that he be not heard," *Mar. 6,* 433, 435.
Somaliland Expedition, Conduct of—Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 8,* 755–759.
Trade, Board of—Appointment of Lord Salisbury as President, *Mar. 13,* 1299–1304.

Loan Fund Board (Ireland)
Report, Annual, Presented, *Mar. 8,* 698; *Mar. 9,* 861.

Local Authorities Officers' Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 10,* 1127.

Local Authorities (Transfer of Powers) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 7,* 600.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.
Secretary—Mr. J. G. Lawson.
Accounts, Standardisation of form of—Appointment of Departmental Committee.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 7,* 575.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
Dispensary Districts, Amalgamation of—Ardee Inquiry Decision.
Qs. Mr. Nolan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 189, 190.
Officials, Terms of Appointment of—Case of T. P. Nolan.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 24, 25; *Mar. 7,* 582.
Orders, Issue of, in Book Form proposed.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 188; *Mar. 8,* 727.
Public Bodies Order 1904, Objections to.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 188, 189.
Qs. Mr. Cogan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 191.
Staff Salaries.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 555.
Union Accounts Order 1904, Objections to.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Delany *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 188, 189.

Local Government Board, Scotland
Inspectors, Medical—Additional Appointments suggested.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 6,* 412.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 3,* 316.

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 2,* 205.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Railways—Derailments of Tender-engines drawing Passenger Trains, Return as to, proposed, *Mar. 10,* 1049.

London
Ambulance Service, Improvement of.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 1,* 5.
Defence of—Expenditure on Earthworks on Surrey Hills.
Q. Mr. Bright; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 14,* 1368.
Gas and Electricity Leakages, Accidents caused by, in Streets.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13,* 1190.
Recruiting Barracks, Removal of, from St. George's, Progress of Negotiations as to, Purchase of Site, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 10,* 1053.
Telephone System, Progress made with Establishment of.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 1,* 18.
Vans, Covered, Accidents with—Operation of New Bye-law.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas, *Mar. 1,* 18.

London and North Western Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1*, 1.

London Building Acts (Amendment) Bill
c. 2R. *Mar. 14*, 1462.

London County Council (Tramway) Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 7*, 553.

London Squares and Enclosures (Preservation) Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 14*, 1333.

London United Tramways (Light Railways Extensions) Order, 1904
Presented, *Mar. 8*, 699; *Mar. 9*, 862.

Londonderry, Marquess of—*Lord President of the Council, and President of the Board of Education*
- Pupil Teachers, Supply of, Grants for, etc., *Mar. 9*, 896.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, S.]
- Aliens, Percentage of, in Receipt of Poor Law Relief, *Mar. 8*, 704.
- Cheltenham Town Council Accounts, Audit of, *Mar. 7*, 575.
- Education, Ireland—Schools—Amalgamation of Boys' and Girls' Schools and Joint Infant Department, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1366.
- Local Government Board Accounts, Standardisation of, Departmental Committee for, *Mar. 7*, 575.
- Meat, Inspection of—Establishing System of Branding or Certificate, proposed *Mar. 10*, 1050.
- Motors.
  - Heavy, Compensation for Damage done by, *Mar. 1*, 6.
  - Offences against the Law, Identification of Motorists, etc., *Mar. 2*, 169.
  - Whistle, Patent, Prohibiting Use of proposed, *Mar. 9*, 906.
- Physical Deterioration Committee Recommendations—Issue of Leaflets to Poor Law Officers, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 576.
- Poor Law.
  - Emigration of Destitute Persons, Powers of Poor Law Guardians as to, *Mar. 2*, 184.
  - Relief, Percentage of Aliens and of Total Population in Receipt of, *Mar. 8*, 704.
- Potatoes, Seed, Free Distribution of, in Distressed Irish Districts, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1358.
- Traction Engines on Roads—Prohibiting Use of Grooved and Corrugated Wheels proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1051.
- Unemployed—Mansion House Committee, Report by, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 907.
- Vaccination Fees, Departmental Committee on—Date of Presenting Report, *Mar. 7*, 559.

Longford
- Constabulary Force, Strength of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14*, 1365.
- Fair Rent Appeals, Date of hearing, Number to be taken, etc.
  - *O.* Mr. Farrell, *Mar. 9*, 958, 959.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 924, 925.
- Land Commission sittings, Date of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson *Mar. 13*, 1187.
- Postal Service to Elphin, Improvement of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 940.

Longworth Estate
- Acreage of, Delays in Disposal of lands, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Roche, Mr. Killbride; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 929.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
- Rochfort Bridge Estate of Mrs. Maher, Purchasers of, *Mar. 6*, 416.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Rt. Hon. C. Scott-Dickson.

Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl Dudley.

Lord President of the Privy Council
Marquess of Londonderry.

Lord Privy Seal
Marquess of Salisbury.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, West]
- Aliens, Number of, in Prisons, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1204.
- Army—Civilians attached to Units, Pay of, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2*, 288.
- Budget, Date of bringing in, *Mar. 8*, 714.
- Business of the House, Course of, *Mar. 8*, 856.
- Criminal Law, Administration of—Commission of Inquiry into Convictions of Innocent Persons, proposed, *Mar. 8*, 730, 731.
- Navy.
  - Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 6*, 463, 464, 522-525; *Mar. 14*, 1409.

[*cont.*

Lough, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont*
Expenditure, Reduction—*cont.*
Amount of, Actually due to New Scheme, *Mar. 14*, 1410.
Flogging in, *Mar. 14*, 1408.
Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, proposals as to, *Mar. 6*, 403, 464; *Mar. 14*, 1409–1412.
Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 6*, 522.
Rosyth Base—Price paid for land, *Mar. 6*, 524.
Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Policy of Constructing inferior type of, *Mar. 14*, 1410.
Works, Borrowings for, Question of Repayment, etc., *Mar. 6*, 524.
Navy Estimates.
Discussion on, *Mar. 9*, 946; *Mar. 13*, 1228.
Vote A., Discussion of whole Naval Policy on, *Mar. 13*, 1322, 1323.
Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill, *Com.*, *Mar. 10*, 1046.
Parliamentary Procedure.
Member called upon by the Speaker to move the Order of the day—*Motion* "That he be not heard," *Mar. 6*, 435.
Private Member securing place by ballot for a motion on going into Supply, Precedence of, over Minister, *Mar. 2*, 203, 205; *Mar. 6*, 429, 430, 435.
Sugar.
Brussels Convention;
Appeals, Date of Hearing etc., *Mar. 6*, 410.
Freights on German Railways—Reduction of rates, *Mar. 13*, 1201.
Russo-German Treaty, Provisions of, *Mar. 13*, 1200, 1201.
Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14*, 1397, 1508.
Unopposed Returns, Objections to, after Midnight, *Mar. 9*, 1038.

Loughrea Union
Potatoes, Seed, Free Grants of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Long, *Mar. 14*, 1358.

Lucas, Mr. R. J. [Portsmouth]
Navy.
Armaments, Reductions in, Negotiations with Foreign Powers with a View to, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 459, 460.
Boilers—Belleville Type, Advantages of, *Mar. 13*, 1321.
Dockyards—Employees' Grievances, Appeal to the Admiralty, etc., *Mar. 6*, 518.
Flogging in, *Mar. 14*, 1407.

Lucas, Mr. R. J.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Gun-Sights, Improvement in, *Mar. 6*, 518.
Inspector of Target Practice for the Fleet, Duties and Emoluments of, etc., *Mar. 6*, 518.
Marines, *Status* of, *Mar. 14*, 1408.
Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 13*, 1315.
Promotion Regulations, *Mar. 3*, 320.
Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Policy of Constructing Inferior Type of, *Mar. 13*, 1321.
Ventilation of Ships, Improvement in Fans, etc., *Mar. 6*, 518, 519.
Volunteers, Value of, Information as to, *Mar. 6*, 461; *Mar. 13*, 1321, 1322.
Whale Island—Date of Completion of Accommodation for Officers, *Mar. 14*, 1368.

Luggacurran Estate
Evicted Tenant, Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 415, 416.

Lugnadiffa
National School, Information as to.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 932, 933.

Lunatics and Lunatic Asylums
Ireland—Monaghan Asylum—Case of Nurse Holland.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9*, 925.

Lundon
Colthurst, Sir G., Sale of Estate of—Turbary Rights of Tenants, *Mar. 9*, 930.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick East]
Jevers, Mr. R., Sale of Estate of—Amount Offered, etc., *Mar. 9*, 925.
Labourers, Conditions of, Necessity for Improvement in, *Mar. 1*, 116–118.

Lyell, Mr. C. H. [Dorset, East]
Navy.
Chaplain and Naval Instructor, Combining Offices of, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1406.
Flogging in, *Mar. 14*, 1406, 1407.
Oil Fuel, Adoption of, Sources of Supply, etc., *Mar. 14*, 1406.
Somaliland Expedition.
Natives.
Arming of, *Mar. 14*, 1375, 1376.
Obligations Towards Tribes, Information as to, *Mar. 14*, 1375, 1376.
Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 8*, 787–789.
Traction Engines, Damage done to Roads by—Prohibiting use of Grooved and Corrugated Wheels, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1050.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A.—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Warwick and Leamington]
- Africa, South.
  - Land Settlement in, Acreage Required, Cost of Land, Number of Settlers, etc., *Mar. 7*, 570.
  - Native Affairs, Commission on—Tabling Report, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 904.
  - War Compensation Claim, Settlement of, *Mar. 8*, 711, 712.
- Africa West—Ibadan, Terms of Holding Land at, *Mar. 2*, 181.
- British Goods, Colonial Import Duties on *Mar. 8*, 712.
- Canada, Withdrawal of British Garrison from, Information as to, *Mar. 14*, 1373.
  - Correspondence, Tabling, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 182.
- Ceylon—Education of Children on Tea Estates, *Mar. 7*, 570.
- Congo Free State, Employment in—Warning to Native Workmen Issued by the Government of Lagos, *Mar. 8*, 713.
- Estate Duties on Colonial Securities, Prevention of Double Payment of, *Mar. 9*, 904.
- Fiscal Policy—Preferential Treatment for Colonies, Food Taxation, etc., *Mar. 8*• 820–825.
- King's Speech—Address in Answer, *Mar. 1* 71.
- Lagos.
  - Government Inscribed Stock, Security for, *Mar. 13*, 1182.
  - Labour for Congo Free State, Government Warning against, *Mar. 8*, 713.
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Legalisation of Colonial Marriages in the United Kingdom, *Mar. 13*, 1182.
- Natal—Church of England Council Petition, Decision as to, *Mar. 2*, 183.
- Parliamentary Procedure—Previous Question used in Connection with a Motion made by Private Member, *Mar. 8*, 824.
- Representative Institutions for the Colonies, Method of Conferring, *Mar. 1*, 13.
- Rhodesia—Case of late J. Murray, *Mar. 8*, 712.
- Sugar—Colonial Bounties, Representation as to Abolition of, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 12.
- Transvaal.
  - Chinese Labour.
    - Disturbances.
      - Method of Dealing with, *Mar. 6*, 393.
      - Notice of, by Employers, *Mar. 2*, 181.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Transvaal—*cont.*
  - Chinese Labour—*cont.*
    - Disturbances—*cont.*
      - Sentences on Rioters, etc. *Mar. 8*, 710.
    - Flogging Regulations, *Mar. 6*, 393
    - Secret Societies, etc., Formation of, *Mar. 1*, 13.
      - Regulations as to, *Mar. 6*, 406; *Mar. 8*, 707.
    - Skilled Labour, Employment on Alleged, *Mar. 7*, 569.
    - Wages, Rate of, *Mar. 14*, 1372, 1374.
  - Labour.
    - Central African Natives in Mines, *Mar. 8*, 707.
    - Chinese, *see subheading* Transvaal—Chinese Labour.
    - Statistics as to, *Mar. 2*, 182.
      - White and Coloured Labour in July, 1899, as to, *Mar. 8*, 708.
    - White Labour.
      - Decline in, Effect of Chinese Labour on, etc., *Mar. 8*, 711.
      - Wages, Rate of, in Mines, *Mar. 8*, 709.
  - Mines.
    - Gold Output in 1904, *Mar. 8*, 708.
    - Labour for, *see subheading* Transvaal—Labour.
    - Premier Mine.
      - Profits of, *Mar. 13*, 1183.
      - Sale of Diamonds, Arrangements as to, *Mar. 13*, 1184.
  - Order, Maintenance of—Military Aid to Civil Power during past Six Months, *Mar. 7*, 569.
- West Indies.
  - Garrisons, Decisions as to, *Mar. 6*, 406
  - Telegraphic Communication between. *Mar. 6*, 406-
- Western Australia—Treatment of Aborigines, *Mar. 1*, 10.

Lytton, Earl of
- Colonial and Indian Forest Service Departments, Transfer of, from Cooper's Hill to University of Oxford, proposed *Mar. 7*, 532–538, 549–552.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool Exchange]
- Merchant Shipping.
  - Boy Sailor Schemes—Withdrawal of Grant—Provision for Payment for Boys Enrolled in Naval Reserve, *Mar. 8*, 700.
  - Collision and Salvage Laws, Unification of—Report of International Conference, *Mar. 14*, 1374.
- Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R., *March 3*, 342–344.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, East]
- Army.
  - Army Corps Scheme, Cost of—Amount Remaining on Vote, *Mar. 2,* 231. 232.
  - Civilians Attached to Units, Pay of, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 287 290, 291.
  - Staff.
    - Changes in, proposed, *Mar. 2.* 232.
    - Expenditure for, Increase in, *Mar. 2,* 230.
  - Financial Position of the Country, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1,* 74–78.
  - Budget Deficits, Method of Meeting, *Mar. 8,* 713, 714.
- National Debt, Position of, *Mar. 1,* 76, 77.
- Navy.
  - Armaments, Reductions in, Negotiations with Foreign Powers with a View to, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 450 454, 455, 465.
  - Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 6,* 451, 452; *Mar. 14,* 1398.
  - Expenditure,
    - Comparison of, with that of Foreign Nations, *Mar. 6,* 454.
    - Reductions in, Amount of, actually due to new Scheme, *Mar. 6* 453; *Mar. 13,* 1254; *Mar. 14,* 1399–1401, 1416, 1420.
  - Obsolete Ships.
    - Elimination of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 6,* 451.
    - Number removed from First Line of Battle, etc., *Mar. 6,* 451.
  - Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 6,* 450–456.
- Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14,* 1397.
- Transvaal War Loan—Date of Payment of first Instalment, *Mar. 1,* 77.

Macdona, Mr. J. C. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
- Navy Reserve—Watermen and Lightermen of London, Enrolment of, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 521.

MacDonnell, Sir A.
- *See under* Ireland.

McHugh, Mr. P. A. [Leitrim, North]
- Athboy—St. James' Mixed National School Residence, Expenditure on, *Mar. 13,* 1195.
- Aughnacashel, Establishment of Telegraph Office at, proposed, *Mar. 8,* 728.
- Education.
  - De la Salla Training College, Admissions to, *Mar. 14,* 1388.

McHugh, Mr. P. A.—*cont.*
- Education—*cont*
  - National School Teachers'
    - Pensions Fund.
      - Abstract, Printing of, *Mar. 7,* 593.
      - Administration of, *Mar. 7,* 593.
      - Investigation into, Date of, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1221, 1222.
    - Promotion on Pension Establishment, *Mar. 7,* 593.
    - Rule 127b, Effect of, *Mar. 13,* 1176.
  - Technical Instruction, Funds available for, *Mar. 7,* 588.
- Melvin, Lough—Memorial as to lowering Water Level, *Mar. 8,* 725.

McKenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
- Army Pay.
  - Deferred, Amount of, Information as to, *Mar. 2,* 257, 258
  - Vote for, Increase in, *Mar. 2,* 242.
- Business of the House—*Motion* to report Progress, *Mar. 2,* 276–278.
- District Railway, Electrification of—Provision as to Driver's Assistant, *Mar. 10,* 1049.
- Indian Army, Reserve for, Arrangements as to, *Mar. 7,* 637.
- Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Rumour as to Resignation of, *Mar. 6,* 528.
- War Office Staff, Inefficiency of, *Mar. 2,* 210, 229.
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney General for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9,* 1035.

McKillop, Mr. W. [Sligo, North]
- Sligo.
  - Distress in—Result of Local Government Board Investigations, *Mar.* , 724.
  - Public Works, Funds available for, *Mar. 8,* 724.

McLaren, Sir C. B. Bright [Leicester, Bosworth]
- Africa, South—Shipping Freights on Boots and Shoes, *Mar. 8,* 717.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
- Colonies, Representative Institutions for, Method of Conferring, *Mar. 1,* 13.
- Education.
  - King's Scholars, Places available for, *Mar. 2,* 170.
  - Underfed Children, Free Meals for, *Mar. 8,* 732, 733.
- Education (Local Authority Default), Act 1904, Application of, *Mar. 7,* 577, 578.
- National Debt Commissioners, Information as to, *Mar. 7,* 571.

[*cont.*

Macnamara, Dr. T. J.—*cont.*
- Physical Deterioration Committee—Adoption of Report and Recommendations, proposed, *Mar. 8*, 732, 733.
- Poisons, Accidents caused by, Precautions against, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1191.
- Savings Bank, Post Office.
  - Balance Sheet—Powers of National Debt Commissioners, etc., *Mar. 7*, 571; *Mar. 14*, 1376.
  - Consols Purchased by, (1894–1899) *Mar. 9*, 920.
  - Deficiency in Income Account of—Measures proposed to render Bank Self-supporting, *Mar. 7*, 571.
  - Deposits.
    - Evasions of Limit of, *Mar. 9*, 922.
    - Reduction of Rate of Interest, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 921.
- South African War.
  - Medals struck for Issue to Natives returned to the Mint and broken up, *Mar 14*, 1370.
  - Stores and Supplies—Report of Comptroller and Auditor-General, *Mar. 13*, 1229; *Mar. 14*, 1369–1371.
- Transvaal.
  - Chinese Labour.
    - Disturbances.
      - British Soldiers employed in suppressing Riots, and bringing back Deserters, alleged, *Mar. 2*, 250.
      - Notice of, by Employers, *Mar. 2*, 181.
      - Sentences on Rioters, Information as to, *Mar. 8*, 710.
    - Skilled Labour, Employment on, alleged, *Mar. 7*, 569.
    - Wages, Rate of, *Mar. 14*, 1373, 1374.
  - Labour, Statistics as to, *Mar. 2*, 182.
    - White Labour, Decline in, Effect of Chinese Labour on, etc., *Mar. 8*, 710.
  - Order, Maintenance of—Military Aid to Civil Power during past Six Months, *Mar. 7*, 569.
- Unemployed—London Committee, Grant from Imperial Exchequer to, suggested, *Mar. 13*, 1174.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
- Admiralty Board, Distribution of Business at—Circulation of Statement, *Mar. 6*, 404.
- Africa, South.
  - Milner, Lord, Resignation of, *Mar. 1*, 29.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S.—*cont.*
- Afrcia, South—*cont.*
  - Selborne, Earl of, Appointment of, as High Commissioner, *Mar. 2*, 201, 202; *Mar. 6*, 432, 491, 492.
    - Qualifications, Salary, etc. *Mar. 6*, 428.
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Instructors, Regulations as to Allocation of, *Mar. 14*, 1387.
- Army.
  - Guards Brigade, Shortage of Officers in—Proposals as to filling Vacancies, *Mar. 14*, 1368.
  - Officers—Japan, Residence and Study in—Applications and Appointments, *Mar. 2*, 178.
  - Staff College Officers—Method of Appointment, *Mar. 2*, 179.
- Chief Secretary for Ireland, Method of Appointing, Tenure of Office, etc., *Mar. 2*, 199, 200.
- Company Directorships held by Ministers of the Crown, *Mar. 6*, 429.
- Education.
  - Dale, Mr., Report of, Observations of Commissioners on, *Mar. 7*, 589.
  - Schools—Age regulations for Male Schools, *Mar. 7*, 588.
- India—Case of Imperator *v.* A. C. Rolt—Presentation of Report proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1192.
- Land Act 1903, Reinstatements under—Tabling Regulations, etc., proposed, *Mar. 6*, 421, 422.
- Law Courts—Evidence of Accused Persons, Irish law as to, *Mar. 6*, 421.
- Minister of the Crown acting as Chairman, Precedents for, *Mar. 2*, 261.
- Navy.
  - Flogging in, *Mar. 2*, 175; *Mar. 6*, 526, 527; *Mar. 7*, 567, 600–607; *Mar. 14*, 1433–1437.
  - Recruiting, Age Regulations, Parental Consent, etc., *Mar. 7*, 606.
- Parliamentary Procedure—Private Member securing place by ballot for a motion on going into Supply, Precedence of, over Minister *Mar. 2*, 204.
- Pettigo Magistracy, Roman Catholic Representation on, *Mar. 8*, 725, 726; *Mar. 13*, 1171.
- Prime Minister, Absence of, from Debates, Alleged, *Mar. 9*, 1040.
- Prisons—Medical Officers, Appointment of, *Mar. 14*, 1487.
- Tibet—Treaty, Negotiations as to, *Mar. 6*, 407.
- Telegraph Service, London—Salary of telegraphists, Increase of, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 575.
- Transvaal.
  - Chinese Labour—Flogging Regulations *Mar. 6*, 393.

[*cont.*

McNeill, Mr. J. G. S.—*cont*
- Transvaal—*cont*
  - Representative Institutions for, Opportunity for discussing, *Mar. 8*, 710.
- Unopposed Returns, Objections to, after Midnight, *Mar. 9*, 1038.
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of— Responsibility of Attorney-General, for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9*, 1034, 1035.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, South]
- Armagh—Catholic Demonstration by Clovenden band, *Mar. 14*, 1385, 1386.
- Belfast Water Supply—Rights of Resident in Mourne catchment area, *Mar. 7*. 584.
- Constabulary, R. I.—Case of Sergeant Sullivan, Evidence of Handwriting expert, *Mar. 7*, 582.
- Customs, Compensation for Retardation of Promotion in, *Mar. 13*, 1191.
- Education —National School Teachers' Salaries, *Mar. 13*, 1193.
- Jurors' Laws, Amendment of, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1388.
- Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Car Scheme.
  - Progress made with, *Mar. 2*, 187, 188.
  - Roads, Funds for Repair of, *Mar. 9*, 929, 930.
- Local Government Board, Ireland.
  - Officials, Terms of Appointment of—Case of T. P. Nolan, *Mar. 1*, 24, 25; *Mar. 7*, 582.
  - Order, Issue of, in book form, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 188; *Mar. 8*, 727.
  - Public Bodies Order, 1904, and Union Accounts Order, 1904, Objections to, *Mar. 2*, 188.
- Minister of the Crown acting as Chairman, Precedents for, *Mar. 2*, 261.
- Navy, Flogging in, *Mar. 14*, 1447, 1448.
- Newry—Case of H. J. Livingstone, *Mar. 1*, 22, 23; *Mar. 7*, 581, 582; *Mar. 9* 935–937; *Mar. 13*, 1214–1216.
- Traction Engines, Damage done to Roads by, Contributions towards upkeep of Roads, etc., *Mar. 8*, 723.

Macedonia
- Kuklish, Salonica, Alleged outrage by Turkish Troops at, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Sir A. Hayter; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 13*, 1173.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Smith; *A.* Earl Percy, 1184.
- Reform Scheme.
  - Despatches to Foreign Countries, Tabling, proposed.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Channing; *As.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 1*, 14, 15.
  - Reports, Issue of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 3*, 320.
  - Tithes, Payment of, in Monastir.
    - *Q.* Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 3*, 319.

Macedonia—*cont.*
- Turkish Customs Duties, Increase in—Applicaton of Surplus to Carrying out Reforms.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Law; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 14*, 1375.

Madagascar
- Convention between United Kingdom and France as to, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 150.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace
- Ireland.
  - Cavan, Appointments in.
    - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 192, 193.
  - Names, Ages, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*. 174.
  - Pettigo—Roman Catholic Representation.
    - *Qs.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 8*, 726; *Mar. 13*, 1171.

Maher Estate
- Sale of, Information as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Mar. 9*, 955, 976; Mr. Atkinson, 976.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 416, 417.

Mail Service
- *See under* Post Office.

Majendie, Mr. J. H. A. [Portsmouth]
- Navy.
  - Armaments, Reductions in, Negotiations with Foreign Powers with a view to, proposed *Mar, 6*, 463.
  - Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 6*, 463.
  - Flogging in, *Mar. 14*, 1445–1447.
  - Policy, changes in, *Mar. 6*, 463.

Malcolm, Mr. I. Z. [Suffolk, Stowmarket].
- Somaliland Expedition—Policy of the Government, *Mar. 8*, 762.

Mall to Charing Cross
- Victoria Memorial.
  - Pillars, Position of.
    - *Q.* Colonel Legge; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Mar. 2*, 186.
  - Progress made with.
    - *Q.* Col. Legge; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Mar. 14*, 1380.

Malone's Divorce Bill
- Petition for Leave to Present, *Mar. 9*, 860.

Malta
- Garrison in, Reduction in, proposed.
  - *Os.* Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 2*, 217; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 221

Manners, Lord C. R. J. (Leicestershire Melton)
Post Office—Late Fee Letters, Regulation as to Posting in Special Boxes, *Mar. 9*, 911.

Marine Insurance Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 8*, 734.

Markham, Mr. A. B. (Notts, Mansfield)
Africa, South—Appointment of Lord Selborne, as High Commissioner, *Mar. 6*, 494, 495.
Bankrupts, undischarged, Company-promoting by, *Mar. 8*, 719.
Coal, Supply of—Royal Commission, Date of Publication of Reports of, *Mar. 8*, 703.
Hooley-Lawson case—Reason for not commencing Criminal Proceedings against Mr. Hooley, *Mar. 8*, 719.
Mines, Accidents in, Inclusion in Returns of Accidents for which Compensation is paid by Employers, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1051.
Transvaal.
Labour Question.
Statistics as to White and Coloured Labour in July, 1899, *Mar. 8*, 708.
White Labour—Rate of Wages in Mines, *Mar. 8*, 708.
Mines.
Gold Output in December 1904 *Mar. 8*, 708.
Premier Mine, Profit of, Arrangements as to Sale of Diamonds, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1183.
Representative Institutions.
Boer Generals, Speeches of, *Mar. 8*, 709.
Discussion, Opportunity for, *Mar. 8*, 710.

Marks, Mr. H. H. (Kent, Thanet)
Somaliland Expedition, *Mar. 8*, 786, 787.
Swine Fever Outbreaks, Improvement of Regulations as to, *Mar. 1*, 4.
Trade, Board of—Appointment of Lord Salisbury as President, *Mar. 13*, 1304–1306.

Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister
Colonial—Legeislation in the United Kingdom.
Q. General Lawrie; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 13*, 1182.

Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 3*, 298.
2R. *Mar. 13*, 1166.

Martin, Mr. R. B. [Worcester, Droitwich]
Telephone Service—Danger of Overhead Wires, *Mar. 7*, 560.

Maryborough
Police Force, Reduction in, proposed.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 586.

Marylebone Chapels Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 7*, 529.
Report from Attorney-General, *Mar. 3*, 297.

Mauritius
Sea-going Passenger-steamer Certificates, Order as to, Presented, *Mar 2*, 150, 164.

May, Isle of
Fisheries, Protection of, Report by Lightkeepers of Illegal Trawling, etc.
Q. Captain Ellice; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 13*, 1188.

Mayo
Marine Works, Progress with.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 399.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1213.
Relief Works in Distressed Districts, Opening of, proposed.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 399.

Meat
Inspection of, Absence of Uniformity in System of—Establishment of System of Branding or Certificate, proposed.
Q. Lord G. Hamilton; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 1050.

Medway and Thames Canal Bill
l. Not to be proceeded with, *Mar. 6*, 385.

Melvin, Lough
Water Level, Memorial as to lowering of.
Q. Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8*, 725.

Merchant Shipping
Boy Sailor Scheme—Withdrawal of Grant—Provision for Payment for Boys enrolled in Naval Reserve.
Q. Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 8*, 700.
Collision and Salvage, Unification of Laws of Maritime States—Report of Brussels International Conference.
Q. Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 14*, 1374.
Foreign Ships—Application of Statutory Powers—Re-appointment of Select Committee, proposed.
Q Mr. A. Taylor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 410.
Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, *see that title.*
Tonnage Measurement, Committee on—Terms of Reference, etc.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 7*, 557.

Merchant Shipping Bill
c 1.R.* *Mar. 2*, 205.

Metric System
Adoption of, proposed.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 1,* 5.

Metropolitan and Great Central Railway Companies Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 3,* 297.

Metropolitan Cattle Market
Accounts Presented, *Mar. 10,* 1041, 1046.

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 13,* 1170.

Metropolitan Railway Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 9,* 858.

Metropolitan Water Board
Report, Annual, Presented, *Mar. 13,* 1131. 1170.
Printing of, *Mar. 14,* 1357.

Mexborough and Swinton Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 3,* 298.

Mid-Suffolk Light Railway (Halesworth Deviation) Order, 1905
Presented, *Mar. 8,* 699; *Mar. 9,* 861.

Military Manœuvres Bill
l. 2R. *Mar. 2,* 151.
Com. Mar. 9, 875.
Rep.* *Mar. 9,* 889.
Rep. from Standing Committee,* *Mar. 14,* 1334.
Debates on Second Reading, [Lords], *Mar. 2,* 151; *and in Committee Mar. 9,* 875.
Five Year Interval in Proclaiming Districts, Objections to, 151, 155, 879.
Notice to Local Authorities, Period of, 152, 155, 156, 875, 879, 880–882.
Restrictions as to enclosed Woods, etc. 152, 155, 157, 158, 875, 883, 885.
Roads, Powers as to Closing, 154, 156, 157, 886, 887, 888.

Militia
Organisation—Report Presented, *Mar. 1,* 3; *Mar. 2,* 150.
Recruiting and Enlistment—Report Presented, *Mar. 1,* 3; *Mar. 2,* 150.

Millstreet
Land Commission Sittings, Arrangements as to.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7,* 562.

Milltown
Sunday post to Belturbet proposed.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9,* 911, 912.

Milner, Lord
See under Africa, South.

Mines
Accidents in, Returns as to—Inclusion of Accidents for which Compensation is paid by Employers, proposed.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 10,* 1051.
Coal Mines, *see that title.*
Electricity in, New Rules for—Date of Coming into force.
Q. Mr Fenwick, *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 9,* 921, 922.

Ministers of the Crown
Company Directorships held by, Conditions Regulating.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6,* 429.

Mitchell, Mr. E. [Fermanagh, N.]
Derrygonelly—Inquiry into Sanitary Condition, *Mar. 13,* 1218.

Monaghan
Lunatic Asylum—Case of Nurse Holland.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 925.

Monkswell, Lord
Military Manœuvres Bill, 2R., *Mar. 2,* 155; Com. *Mar. 9,* 880.

Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, North.]
Macedonian Reforms.
Reports, Issue of, *Mar. 3,* 320.
Tithes, Payment of in Monastir, *Mar. 3,* 319.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Dublin County, South]
Army Civilians Attached to Units, pay of, *Mar. 2,* 287.
Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, 2R., *Mar. 9,* 1009.

Moore, Mr. W. [Antrim, North.]
Irish Language, Letters Addressed in *Mar. 13,* 1221.
Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, 2R., *Mar. 9,* 1019.

Morgan, Mr. D. J. [Essex, Walthamstow]
India—Crops, Damage to, by Frost, Provisions against Distress, etc., *Mar. 1,* 7.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, West]
Navy, Flogging in, *Mar. 14,* 1443–1445.

Morgan, P. S., Estate of
Purchase of, by Captain J. Morgan—Case of J. J. Greene.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 934.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J. [Montrose, etc.]
  Evicted Tenants, Ireland, Re-instatement of, *Mar. 7*, 681–684.
  MacDonnell, Sir A.
    Censure of, by the Cabinet—Statement and Correspondence, etc. Tabling proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1224.
    Conditions of Appointment, *Mar. 13* 1224, 1225.

Morocco
  Convention between United Kingdom and France as to, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 150.

Morrell, Mr. G. H. [Oxon, Woodstock.]
  Children, Employment of, for ingathering of Crops, *Mar. 7*. 558.
  King's Scholars, Applications from, for Entrance to Residental Colleges, *Mar. 7*, 559.

Motors
  Heavy Cars, Damage caused by, Compensation for.
    Q. Mr. W. Keswick; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 1*, 6.
  Iveagh-Pirrie Scheme, *see under Ireland.*
  Offences against the law, Identification of Motorists, etc.
    Q. Mr. Cawley; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 2*, 169.
  Scotland—Heavy Motor Traffic Regulations.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 2*, 186.
  Whistle, Patent, Prohibiting use of, proposed.
    Q Mr. Seely; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 9*, 906.

Mount, Mr. W. A. [Berks, Newbury]
  Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 348.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill
  c. 1R.* *Mar. 9*, 902.

Municipal Corporations (Merthyr Tydfil Scheme Confirmation) Bill
  l. 2R.* *Mar. 1*, 151.

Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill
  c. 2R. *Mar. 3*, 377.
  Bill withdrawn, *Mar. 3*, 383.
  Councillors, Extension of Residential Radius for, proposed.
    Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Mar. 3*, 378.
  Trading Companies, Extension of Franchise to, proposed.
    Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Mar. 3*, 377-380, 383; Mr. Dalziel, 378, 379; Mr. H. Samuel, 379, 380; Mr. C. Warner, 380, 381; Mr. Slack, 381, 382; Mr. Burns, 382, 383.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, East]
  Eviction Re-instatements, Progress made with, *Mar. 9*, 983, 984.
  Kerry.
    County Council Audit, Result of, *Mar. 2*, 190.; *Mar. 6*, 400.
    Evictions and Re-instatements, *Mar. 6*, 414.
  Land Act, 1903—Estates Commissioners, Instructions and Regulations issued to—Tabling, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 982.
  Land Commission—Fair Rent Appeals, Delay in Hearing, *Mar. 9*, 983.
  Magistrates, Names, etc. of, *Mar. 2*, 174.
  Sands, Mr. Collis, Estate of—Terms of Sale, etc., *Mar. 6*, 415.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
  Civil Service Abstractor Clerks, Decision as to Memorial from, *Mar. 2*, 184, 185.
  Dublin.
    Carmen in, Police proceedings against, for obstruction, *Mar. 10*, 1047.
    Joint Stock Companies, Information as to, *Mar. 2*, 199.
    Post Office.
      Duties, Allocation of, *Mar. 13*, 1221.
      Overtime of Postmen at Christmas Payment of, *Mar. 7*, 591, 592.
      Sorters, Auxiliary, Employment of, *Mar. 7*, 592, 593.
    Viceregal Lodge, Painting Work at *Mar. 2*, 198.
  Post Office.
    Bradford Committee, Report of, Adoption of, proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1206, 1207.
    Dublin Post Office, *see under subheading* Dublin.
  Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, 2R. *Mar. 9*, 1010-1012.

Natal
  Church of England Council Petition, Decision as to,
    Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 2*, 182, 183.

National Debt
  Annual Service of, Increase in.
    O. Sir R. Reid, *Mar. 1*, 57.
  Funded and Unfunded Debt.
    Position of.
      Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1*, 37; Mr. Guest, 44; Mr. G. Bowles. 69; Mr. McCrae, 76.
    Reduction of Unfunded Debt, Methods of.
      O. Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 1*, 77.

[*cont.*

National Debt—*cont.*
Funded and Unfunded Debt—*cont.*
Sinking Fund for.
Os. Mr. Guest, *Mar. 1*, 44, 89; Mr. G. Bowles, 69, 74; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 88, 89.
Position of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1*, 37; Mr. Guest, 42; Sir R. Reid, 56.
Reduction of.
Commissioners.
Information as to.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 7*, 571.
Savings Banks Balance Sheets, etc., Powers as to.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 7*, 571; *Mar. 14*, 1376, 1377.
Provision for.
O. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1*, 89.
Transvaal War Contribution as a Means of.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 1*, 72, 73; Mr. McCrae, 77.
Sinking Fund.
Suspension of, Objections to.
O. Mr. Guest, *Mar. 1*, 45.
Terminable Annuities, portion of, available for
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1*, 90.

National Gallery
Lighting of—Provision for Artificial Light, proposed.
Q. Col. Stopford-Sackville; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 3*, 317, 318.

National Telephone Company
See under Telephone Service.

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 1*, 30.

Naval Prize Bill
l. 1R.* *Mar. 9*, 900.
2R., *Mar. 13*, 1167.

Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 7*, 529.

Navy
First Lord—Earl of Cawdor.
Financial Secretary—Mr. Pretyman.
Armaments, Reductions in, Negotiations with Foreign Powers with a view to, proposed.
Os. Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 6*, 450, 454, 455, 465; Mr. H. Roberts, 457–459; Mr. R. Lucas, 459, 460; Mr. Majendie, 463; Mr. Pretyman, 465, 466.

Navy—*cont.*
Atlantic Fleet—Repairing of Vessels at Gibraltar.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7*, 615.
Bases.
Defence of, Objections to Placing in Hands of Military Authorities, etc.
Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Mar. 13*, 1270; Mr. Pretyman, 1312.
Foreign and Colonial, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6*, 488; *Mar. 13*, 1318, 1319.
New, Organisation of.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 437.
Rosyth, *see that subheading.*
Strategic Importance of.
Os. Mr. C. Wason, *Mar. 6*, 519, 520; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7*, 613.
Battleships.
Guns on, Calibre of.
O. Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 6*, 474.
King Edward VII. Type, Cost of, Number Constructed, etc.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 6*, 473; Mr. Buchanan, 485, 486.
Re-armouring Ships of "Canopus," "Majestic" and "Royal Sovereign" Classes, proposed.
O. Mr. J. F. Hope, *Mar. 14*, 1405.
Boilers.
Belleville Type, Adoption of.
Os. Mr. R. Lucas, *Mar. 13*, 1321; Mr. Runciman, *Mar. 14*, 1423.
Tubular and Cylindrical, Proportion between.
Os. Mr. Whitley, Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 14*, 1422.
Boy Sailor Scheme—Withdrawal of Grant—Provision for Payment for Boys Enrolled in Naval Reserve.
Q. Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 8*, 700.
"Centurion," Defects in Gunsights of.
O. Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 6*, 482.
Chaplain and Naval Instructor, Combining Offices of, proposed.
O. Mr. Lyell, *Mar. 14*, 1406.
Clinton Estate, Admiralty purchase of land on.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 1*, 10.
"Clio" and "Cadmus," H.M.S.—Date of laying down, Date of completion, Cost, Removal from active list.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 402, 403.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Clyde River, vessels anchored in, Nuisance caused by.
O. Mr. Ainsworth, *Mar. 7*, 619, 620.
Qs. Mr. Ainsworth, *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 9*, 916, 917; *Mar. 13*, 1199.

Colonial Contributions towards cost of.
O. Sir F. Flannery, *Mar. 13*, 1275.

Command of the Sea a vital necessity to Great Britain.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 6*, 471, 472; Sir E. Lees, *Mar. 14*, 1427, 1428.

Construction, *see subheading* Ship-building.

Cruisers.

Nnmber to be struck off effective list.
O. Mr. Lough, *Mar. 14*, 1409, 1410.

Designs, *see under subheading* Ship-building.

Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 13*, 300, 311.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 437; Mr. McCrae, 451, 452; Mr. Kearley, 462; Mr. Haldane, 469; Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar 13*, 1231, 1241–1243; Mr. Pretyman, 1250, 1251; Mr. Runciman, 1251; 1279–1281; Lord G. Hamilton, 1265; Sir J. Colomb, 1284, 1285; Mr. Buchanan, 1315; Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 14*, 1398; Mr. Black, 1404; Mr. Yerburgh, 1414, 1415.

Return Presented, *Mar. 13*, 1130, 1170.

Dockyards.

Accounts Presented, *Mar. 7*, 554.

Expenses Accounts, Alteration in form of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*, 1199, 1200.

Administration of.

Committee on, Constitution of.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*, 1256; Mr. Kearley, 1261; Sir J. Colomb, 1283.

Reforms in.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 6*, 482, 483; Mr. Duke, 483–485; Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 13*, 1261.

Chatham Extension Works, Progress made with, Policy as to, etc.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6*, 489.

Decentralisation Scheme.
O. Sir F. Flannery, *Mar. 13*, 1274.

Distribution of Work between Government and Private Yards.
Os. Mr. Benn, *Mar. 13*, 1270, 1271.

Navy—*cont.*

Dockyards—*cont.*

Employees' Grievances, Appeal to the Admiralty, etc.
Os. Mr. Duke, *Mar. 6*, 484; Mr. R. Lucas, 518; Mr. Benn, *Mar. 13*, 1271, 1272.

Repairs, Comparative Cost of, in Private, and Government Yards.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6*, 487, 488; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*, 1257; Mr. Kearley, 1260; Lord G. Hamilton, 1268, 1269, Mr. Benn, 1270, 1271; Mr. Runciman 1279; Mr. J. F. Hope, *Mar. 14*, 1405.

"Dominion," H.M.S., Gunsights of, New System of Gearing, etc.
O. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*, 1256.

"Drake," H.M.S., Improvement in Gunsights of.
O. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*, 1256.

Duties of.
O. Sir E. Lees, *Mar. 14*, 1427.

Education and Training of Officers and Men, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 442.

Effective and Non-Effective List, Number Age, Cost, etc., of Vessels struck off.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 6*, 449, Mr. Buchanan, 490; Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13*, 1231, 1232; 1244; Mr. Bowles, 1234, 1235; Mr. Buchanan, 1315–1317; Mr. Pretyman, 1316; Mr. Lough, *Mar. 14*, 1411, 1412; Mr. Pretyman, 1411.

Return.

Presented, *Mar. 6*, 390; *Mar. 7*, 554.
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 403.

Efficiency, Necessity for Maintaining a High Standard of.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 6*, 471, 472.

"Enchantress" Admiralty Yacht, Cost of.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 2*, 175, 176; *Mar. 7*, 705, 706.

Expenditure.

Comparison of, with that of Foreign Nations.
O. Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 6*, 454.

Increase in.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1*, 32.

Ireland, Contribution of, towards Injustice of.
O. Mr. Power, *Mar. 7*, 618, 619.

[cont.

Navy—*cont.*
Expenditure—*cont.*
Reduction in.
Os. Mr. Guest, *Mar. 1,* 48; Sir R. Reid, 58; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 436, 465; Mr. H. Roberts, 456; Mr. Majendie, 463; Mr. Lough, 463, 464, 522–525; Mr. Haldane, 472, 475; Mr. Buchanan, 487; Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13,* 1244; Mr. Pretyman, 1252–1254; Lord G. Hamilton, 1264; Sir F. Flannery, 1272; Sir J. Colomb, 1282; Mr. Lough, *Mar. 14,* 1409; Mr. Bright, 1429, 1430.

Amount of, actually due to New Scheme.
Os. Mr. M'Crae, *Mar. 6,* 453; Mr. E. Robertson *Mar. 13,* 1244; Mr. Pretyman, 1252–1254; Mr. M'Crae, 1254; *Mar. 14,* 1399–1401, 1416, 1420; Mr. Lough, 1410; Mr. Pretyman, 1416.

Relation of, to Taxation of the Country.
Os. Mr. H. Roberts, *Mar. 6,* 457, 458.

Total Estimated, for 1905–6.
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 6,* 449, 450.

Flogging of Boys in.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Mar. 6,* 526, 527; *Mar. 7,* 600–607; Mr. G. Bowles, 607–608; Mr. Tomkinson, 616, 617; Mr. Power, 618; Mr. Lyell, *Mar. 14,* 1406, 1407; Mr. R. Lucas, 1407; Mr. Lough, 1408; Mr. Pretyman, 1418, 1441, 1442, 1448; Mr. S. MacNeill, 1433–1437; Mr. Broadhurst, 1438–1441; Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. Hunt, 1442; Mr. L. Morgan, 1443–1445; Mr. Majendie, 1445–1447; Mr. Macveagh, 1447, 1448; Mr. J. Devlin, 1448.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar 2,* 175.

Cadets and Midshipmen, Exemption of.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Mar. 7,* 604; Mr. G. Bowles, 607; Mr. Lyell, *Mar. 14,* 1407; Mr. E. Robertson, 1442; Mr. Majendie. 1446.

Canes and Birches used, Weight of, etc.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Mar. 7,* 605; Mr. Lyell, *Mar. 14,* 1407.

Publicity in Carrying out Sentence, Objections to.
Os. Mr. Lyell, *Mar. 14,* 1407; Mr. Pretyman, 1419.

Navy—*cont.*
Flogging of Boys in—*cont.*
Regulations as to, Explanation of, prior to Engagement, etc.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Mar. 7,* 601–606.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 7,* 567.

Return as to.
O. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Mar. 7,* 605.

Gunnery.

Appliances for Shooting, and Training of *personnel,* Improvement in.
O. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 443.

Fire Control in Action, Adoption of Committee Recommendations as to.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 443.

Inspector of Target Practice for the Fleet, Appointment of—Duties and Emoluments of Office, etc.,
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 443; Sir J. Colomb, 479, 480; Mr. Kearley, 481; Mr. R. Lucas, 518; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13,* 1259, 1260; Mr. G. Bowles, 1260; Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 14,* 1414.

Night Firing, Arrangements for Practice in.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 6,* 481. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13,* 1255.

Practice Returns, Improvements in Shooting shown by.
O. Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 14,* 1414.

Responsibility of Officers for.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7,* 610.

Guns on Battleships, Calibre of.
O. Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 6,* 474.

Gun-sights, Improvement in.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 443; Mr. Kearley, 482; Mr. R. Lucas, 518; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13,* 1256.

"Centurion," of, *see subheading* "Centurion."

"Harrier" and "Barham," H.M.S., Speed and Fishery Duties of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 404.

Marines, *Status* of.
O. Mr. R. Lucas, *Mar. 14,* 1408.

Mobility, Importance of.
O. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 437.

North American Squadron—Commander-in-Chief, Official Residence of.
O. Gen. Laurie, *Mar. 14,* 1403.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Obsolete Ships, Elimination of.

[*See also subheading* Effective.]

Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 437, 438, 451; Mr. M'Crae, 451; Mr. Kearley, 462; Mr. Lough, 464; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7*, 612, 613; Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13*, 1231, 1244; Lord G. Hamilton, 1235, 1236, 1266; Sir J. Colomb, 1236, 1284; Mr. Pretyman, 1253; Mr. Kearley, 1261; Sir F. Flannery, 1274; Mr. Runciman, 1281; Mr. Buchanan, 1315; Mr. R. Lucas, 1321; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 14*, 1421; Mr. Bright, 1429, 1430.

Q. Major Seely; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 8*, 704.

Breaking up in England, proposed.

Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Pretyman. *Mar. 13*, 1200.

Classification of.

Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*, 1199.

Cruisers, Number, and Ages of Ships.

Os. Mr. Lough, *Mar. 14*, 1409, 1410.

Number of Ships removed from first Line of Battle, etc.

Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 438; Mr. McCrae, 451.

Officers.

Education and Training of, Proposals as to.

Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 442

Retirement, Compulsory—Reduction of Age.

Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 2*, 169.

Sea Service as a qualification for Advancement of, Publication of Order in Council, relating to, proposed.

O. Sir J. Colomb, *Mar. 6*, 478.

Oil Fuel.

Adoption of, Sources of Supply, etc.

Os. Sir F. Flannery, *Mar. 13*, 1276; Mr. Lyell, *Mar. 14*, 1406; Mr. Pretyman, 1421, 1422.

Cost of —Comparison with that of Coal.

Os. Mr. E. Wason, *Mar. 14*, 1422; Mr. Pretyman, 1422, 1423.

Pacific, British Position in, Necessity for maintaining a strong Fleet, etc.

Os. Sir J. Colomb, *Mar. 13*, 1285, 1286; Gen. Laurie, *Mar. 14*, 1401, 1402; Mr. Pretyman, 1417.

Personnel.

Efficiency of, increasing.

O. Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 14*, 1413.

Navy—*cont.*

Personnel—cont.

Redistribution of, under the new Scheme.

Os. Sir J. Colomb, *Mar. 13*, 1284, 1285; Mr. Pretyman, 1311.

Reduction in Number of.

Os. Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 6*, 472, 473; Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 13*, 1320; Mr. Labouchere, *Mar. 14*, 1424.

Shortage in.

O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 6*, 611, 612.

Police Duties of the Fleet.

Os. Mr. Runciman, *Mar. 13*, 1251; Mr. Pretyman, 1252; Lord G. Hamilton, 1265; Gen. Laurie, *Mar. 14*, 1401; Mr. Labouchere, 1425.

Policy, Changes in.

Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1*, 40; Sir Vincent, 52; Sir R. Reid, 58; Mr. G. Bowles, 65; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 87; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6*, 436; Mr. McCrae, 450–456; Mr. H. Roberts, 456, 457; Mr. Majendie, 463; Mr. Haldane, 469–476; Sir J. Colomb, 476; Mr. Buchanan, 486–491; Mr. Lough, 522; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7*, 608-611; Mr. Runciman, *Mar. 13*, 1277, 1278; Mr. Buchanan, 1313, 1314; Mr. Black, *Mar. 14*, 1403, 1404.

Cost of—Reduction in Expenditure due to, etc.

Os. Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 6*, 453; Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13*, 1244; Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 14*, 1399-1401, 1416, 1420; Mr. Lough, 1410; Mr. Pretyman, 1416, 1420.

Preparendess for War, question as to.

O. Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 14*, 1413.

Promotions, Regulations as to.

Q. Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 3*, 320.

Recruiting for—Age Regulations, Parental Consent, etc.

Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 7*, 606.

Repairs.

Cost of—Comparative, in Private, and Government Dockyards.

Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6*, 487, 488; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13*; 1257; Mr. Kearley, 1260; Lord G. Hamilton, 1268, 1269; Mr. Benn, 1270, 1271; Mr. Runciman, 1279; Mr. J. F. Hope, *Mar. 14*, 1405.

Gibraltar and Malta, Carrying out repairs at, Cost of, etc.

Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 13*, 1320.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Repairs—*cont.*

Ships to be struck off Effective List, Estimate for repairs to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13,* 1232, 1245, 1246; Mr. Pretyman, 1232, 1245, 1253; Mr. Kearley, 1262; Mr. Buchanan, 1317.

Reserve.

Increase in Strength of.
O. Sir F. Flannery, *Mar. 13,* 1274.

Royal Fleet, Present strength of.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Pretyman *Mar. 10,* 1047, 1048.

Watermen and Lightermen of London, Enrolment of, proposed.
O. Mr. C. Macdona, *Mar. 6,*521.

Reserve Squadron.

Constitution of.
O. Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3,* 300.
Os. Mr. Pretymann, *Mar. 6,* 438, 439; Mr. Buchanan, 491.

Maintaining in readiness for Action, proposed.
O. Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 14,* 1414.

Return—Date of issuing Part II.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 9,* 946.

Rosyth Base.

Abandonment of, Information as to,
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7,* 614; Mr. O. Williams, 620.

Dockyards, Works at, Progress made with, Policy as to, etc.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6,* 489, 517; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13,* 1257; Mr. Runciman, 1277; Mr. Black, Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 14,* 1423.

Price paid for land.
Os. Mr. C. Wason, *Mar. 6,* 520; Mr. Lough, 524; Mr. G. Bowles, 614.

Scouts.

Construction of, Information as to.
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13,* 1248.

Cost, Purposes and Success of, Information as to.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6,* 438.

Shipbuilding.

Designs.

Committee on.

Constitution and terms of Reference of.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13,* 1249; Mr. Pretyman, 1254, 1255; Lord G. Hamilton,1266; Sir F. Flannery, 1275; Sir J. Colomb,1282,1283.

Navy—*cont.*

Shipbuilding—*cont.*

Designs—*cont.*

Committee on—*cont.*

Work of, Importance of.
O. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 440.

Initial stages of, Importance of.
O. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 439, 440.

Secrecy with regard to.
O. Sir J. Colomb, *Mar. 13,* 1282; Mr. Pretyman, 1311.

Foreign Navies, Comparison with—Vessels built and building, Return ordered, *Mar. 6,* 391.

Programme 1905–6.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 446, 447; Mr. Haldane, 473; Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 14,* 1416.

Estimates for, Discrepancies in.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13,* 1246–1248; Mr. Pretyman, 1254.

Rate of, Acceleration in, Advantages of, etc.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 441, 442; Mr. Haldane, 473; Mr. Buchanan, 487.

Shooting, *see subheading* Gunnery.

Staff College, Establishment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 442, 443.

Stations at Halifax and Esquimault handed over to the Canadian Government, Policy of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6,* 489; Mr. C. Wason, 520; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7,* 614, 615, 616; Gen. Laurie, Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13,* 1258; Mr. Buchanan, 1318; Gen. Laurie, *Mar. 14,* 1402, 1403; Mr. Pretyman, 1416, 1417.
Qs Sir J. Colomb, Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 14,* 1373.

Strength, Comparison with Fleets of Germany, France and United States.
Os. Mr. Runciman, *Mar. 13,* 1280, 1281; Mr. Yerburgh, *Mar. 14,* 1415.

Submarines.

Construction, Information as to.
Os. Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 444, 445; Sir J. Colomb, 476; *Mar. 13,* 1283.

Cost of.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 445.

Estimate for, Information as to.
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13,* 1248.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
- Submarines—*cont.*
  - Value of, for Offensive and Defensive Purposes, etc.
    - *Os.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 445, 446; Mr. Haldane, 473, 474.
- Torpedo Boat Destroyers.
  - Construction of Inferior Type of, Policy of.
    - *Os.* Sir J. Colomb, *Mar. 13,* 1283, 1284; Mr. Pretyman, 1311, 1312; Mr. R. Lucas, 1321; Mr. Lough, *Mar. 14,* 1410; Mr. Pretyman, 1421.
  - Speed of, Information as to.
    - *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *Mar. 6,* 474.
- Torpedo Boats, Design and Speed of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Kearley, *Mar. 13,* 1262–1264; Mr. Pretyman, 1263, 1264.
- Ventilation of Ships, Improvement in Fans, etc.
  - *O.* Mr. R. Lucas, *Mar. 6,* 518, 519.
- Volunteers, Value of, Information as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. R. Lucas, *Mar. 6,* 461; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7,* 611; Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 13,* 1258; Mr. R. Lucas, 1321, 1322.
- Watermen and Lightermen of London, Formation of, into a Reserve, proposed.
  - *O.* Mr. C. Macdona, *Mar. 6,* 521.
- Wei-hai-wei, Works at, Abandonment of, alleged.
  - *Os.* Mr. Buchanan *Mar. 6,* 490, 517; Mr. C. Wason, 519; Mr. A. Lee, 526; Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 7,* 614; Mr. O. Williams, 620.
- Whale Island—Date of Completion of Accommodation for Officers.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 14,* 1368.
- Works.
  - Borrowings for, Question of Repayment, etc.
    - *O.* Mr. Lough, *Mar. 6,* 524.
  - Loan Expenditure on.
    - *Q.* Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 13,* 1172.
  - Vote for, Increase in.
    - *O.* Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6,* 489, 490.
- Works Acts.
  - Expenditure under.
    - *Q.* Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 6,* 404, 405.
    - Details of, Information as to.
      - *Os.* Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 13,* 1318, 1319.
    - Estimated, for Current Year.
      - *O.* Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6,* 490, 517.
    - Memorandum presented, *Mar. 6,* 386, 390.

Navy—*cont.*
- Works Bill.
  - Date of Introduction of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 6,* 404.
  - Details of, Information as to.
    - *Os.* Mr. A. Lee, *Mar. 6,* 525 Mr. C. Warner, 526.
  - Loan Works Bills, Objections to System of.
    - *O.* Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 36, 37.

Navy Estimates
- Date of Taking.
  - *Os.* Mr. E. Robertson, Sir A. Acland-Hood, *Mar. 3,* 384.
- Discussion on.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lough, Mr. E. Robertson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1228, 1229.
- Reduction in.
  - *Os.* Mr. Guest, *Mar. 1,* 48; Sir R. Reid, 58.
  - *O.* Earl Spencer, *Mar. 3,* 315.
  - *Os.* Mr. Pretyman, *Mar. 6,* 436, 465 Mr. H. Roberts, 456; Mr. Majendie, 463; Mr. Lough, 463, 464, 522–525; Mr. Haldane, 472, 475; Mr. Buchanan, 487; Mr. E. Robertson, *Mar. 13,* 1244; Mr. Pretyman, 1252–1254; Lord G. Hamilton, 1264; Sir F. Flannery, 1272; Sir J. Colomb, 1282; Mr. Lough, *Mar. 14,* 1409; Mr. Bright, 1429, 1430.
- Sea and Coast Services (129,100), *Com., Mar. 7,* 266; *Mar. 13,* 1231, 1311.
- Statement [Mr. Pretyman], *Mar. 6,* 435–448.
- Vote A—Discussion of whole Naval Policy on.
  - *Os.* Mr. J. Walton, *Mar. 13,* 1322; Mr. Lough, 1322, 1323; Mr. Churchill, 1323; Mr. Jeffreys, 1322–1324.
- Vote A and Vote I, Date of Taking.
  - *Os.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 9,* 945; Mr. Lough, 946.
- Wages, etc.—£6,672,000, *Com., Mar. 14.* 1398.

New Hebrides
- Convention between United Kingdom and France as to, Presented, *Mar. 2,* 150.

New Writs and New Members Sworn
- *See under* Parliamentary Elections.

Newcastle Chapter (Amendment) Bill
- *l.* 2R. *Mar. 6,* 387.
- *Com.* and *Rep.** *Mar. 13,* 1131.

Newfoundland
- Convention between United Kingdom and France as to, Presented, *Mar. 2,* 150.

Newman Estate
- Sale of, Exclusion of Tenants, etc.
  - *O.* Mr. Flynn, *Mar. 9,* 964.

Newry

Livingstone, H. J., Case of—Execution of Extradition Warrant, etc.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 1,* 22, 23.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 7,* 581, 582.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 9,* 935–937.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 13,* 1214–1216.

Newtown Stewart

Labourers' Cottage Scheme, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Hemphill; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8,* 704, 705.

Newtownforbes

Purchase of, under Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, proposed.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14,* 1365.

Nolan, Mr. J. [Louth, S.]

Dispensary Districts in Ireland, Amalgamation of—Ardee Inquiry Decision, *Mar. 2,* 189, 190.

Norman, Mr. H. [Wolverhampton, South]

Criminal Statistics for 1903, Delay in Publication of, *Mar. 14,* 1377.

North British Railway (General Powers) Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 6,* 389.

North Lindsey Light Railways Order 1900 (North Lindsey Light Railways (Amendment) Order 1905)

Presented, *Mar. 8,* 698; *Mar. 9,* 862.

North Sea

British Trawlers Fired on by Baltic Fleet, Inquiry as to—Result of Investigation.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 1,* 18.

Fishery Investigations, Vessels Employed in—Reason for Substituting "Jackal" for "Goldseeker."
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 8,* 721.

Northbrook, Earl of

Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *Mar. 9,* 857.

Northumberland, Duke of

Vaccination of Children of School age, Legislation as to, proposed, *Mar. 10,* 1042–1044.

Norton, Captain C. W. [Newington, West]

Army.
- Artillery Armament, Committee on, Date of Appointment, etc. *Mar. 1,* 11.

Norton, Captain C. W.—*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
- Civilians Attached to Units, Pay of, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 290.
- Guns.
  - New Designs, Date of Ordering Trial Guns, etc., *Mar. 1,* 12.
  - Orders, Allocation of, Method of Paying, etc., *Mar. 2,* 177.
- Indian, *see subheading* Indian.
- Nine Years' Service System, proposals as to, *Mar. 2,* 237, 238; *Mar. 9,* 917.
- Pay, Deferred, Amount of, *Mar. 2,* 260.
- Recruiting for Home Service Army, Introduction of, *Mar. 1,* 11.
- Reserve, Strength of, *Mar. 7,* 639.
- Rifles, New, Information as to, *Mar. 1,* 11; *Mar. 6,* 405.
  - Small Arms Factory Views on Specifications, *Mar. 2,* 177.
- Short Service Scheme, Decision as to, *Mar. 9,* 917.
- South African Garrison—Unpopularity of the Service, *Mar. 2,* 239.

Indian Army.
- Drafts for—Condition of Men sent out, *Mar. 2,* 238.
- Reserve for, Arrangements as to *Mar. 7,* 638.

National Telephone Company, Agreement with, Discussion of, *Mar. 14,* 1361.

Russo-Japanese War—British Officers attached to Belligerent Forces, *Mar. 2,* 223, 224.

South African War—Defective Ammunition, Value of, Source of Supply, etc., *Mar. 14,* 1370.

Telegraphists.
- Grievances of, as to inducements to enter the Service, *Mar. 2,* 183.
- London, Maximum Salary in, *Mar. 7,* 561.

Norway

Telegraphic Communication with Great Britain, Agreement as to, Presented, *Mar. 10,* 1047; *Mar. 13,* 1130.

Norwich Union Life Insurance Society Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 6,* 389.

Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill

c. *Com. Mar. 9,* 900; *Mar. 10,* 1045; *Mar. 13,* 1168.

Nottingham and Retford Railway Bill

c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 1.

Nurses

Society for the Higher Education of, Grant of Licence for.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G Balfour, *Mar. 13,* 1202.

Nymphsfield
- St. Joseph's Roman Catholic School, Decision as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Boland; *As.* Sir W. Anson, *Mar. 8*, 720, 721; *May 14*, 1379.

O'Brien, Mr. K. Tipperary, Mid.]
- Evictions, Re-instatement of Tenants, etc., *Mar. 7*, 657–659.
- Post Office Messengers, Adult Night—Pay, Good Conduct Awards, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1186.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny].
- Select Committees on Railway Bills, appointment of Railway Director to act on, *Mar. 14*, 1381–1383.

O'Brien, Mr. P. J. [Tipperary, N.]
- Glastrigan Postal Arrangements, Improvement of, *Mar. 8*, 701.

O'Brien Estate
- Sale of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 189; *Mar. 6*, 422, 423.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]
- Army Manœuvres, Holding, on St. Patrick's Day in Ireland, Alleged, *Mar. 13*, 1181.
- Clones Telegraph Office, Violation at, of Regulations as to Secrecy of Telegrams, *Mar. 14*, 1361.
- Post Office
  - Dismissal of Officials, Regulations as to, *Mar. 8*, 702.
  - Postmen.
    - Good-conduct Stripes, Forfeited, Rule as to Recovery of, *Mar. 8*, 702.
    - Gratuity to, on being incapacitated by an accident—Case of J. Webb, *Mar. 14*, 1362.
  - Volunteers in—Facilities for Camp Leave, *Mar. 8*, 702.
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney General, for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9*, 1029.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
- Chief Secretary for Ireland, Date of Appointing, *Mar. 9*, 1039.
- Distress in Ireland, Cause of, and Method of Dealing with, *Mar. 14*, 1490.
- Evicted Tenants, Progress made in Reinstatement of, *Mar. 7*, 684–687; *Mar. 9*, 994.
- Land Act, 1903—Estates Commissioners, Instructions and Regulations issued to—Tabling, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 991–996.
  - *Status* of, Administrative Functions, etc., *Mar. 9*, 991–996.
- Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14*, 1510.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P.—*cont.*
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney-General for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9*, 1036.

O'Donnell, Mr. J. [Mayo, S.]
- Ballyhaunis Dispensary District Maternity Nurse, *Mar. 3*, 320, 321.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
- Beet Cultivation, Encouragement of, *Mar. 9*, 932.
- Gore-Booth Estate, Sale of.
  - Ballymote, Exclusion of, *Mar. 9*, 931, 932; *Mar. 13*, 1213.
  - Refusal of Advances to Town Tenants, Alleged, *Mar. 6*, 417.
- King-Harman Estate, Sale of—Inclusion of Boyle, *Mar. 13*, 1213.
- Land Act 1903—Estates Commissioners, Date of Presenting Report of, *Mar. 7*, 585.
- Larknill School Accommodation for Roman Catholic Children, *Mar. 3*, 321.
- Lugnadiffa National School, Information as to, *Mar. 9*, 932.
- Sligo—Funds available for Public Works, *Mar. 8*, 725; *Mar. 13*, 1214.

O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, N.]
- County and District Council Election in Ireland—Persons qualified to act as Presiding Officers, *Mar. 13*, 1212.
- Distress in the West of Ireland—Particulars of Relief Works, *Mar. 14*, 1391.
- Mayo Marine Works, Decision as to, *Mar. 13*, 1213.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
- Crofton, Lord, Estate of—Sale of Grazing Land, *Mar. 2*, 192.
- King-Harman Estate—Exclusion of Portions from Sale, *Mar. 7*, 583.
- Poor Law (Ireland) Reform Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *Mar. 2*, 187.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]
- Distress in Ireland, Cause of, and Method of dealing with, *Mar. 14*, 1478.
- Galway Relief Works, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1193.
- Local Government Board, Ireland—Staff Salaries, *Mar. 7*, 555.
- Poor Law, Ireland—Officers' Salaries, Promotions, etc., *Mar. 7*, 555, 556.

O'Mara, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, S.]
- Army.
  - India, Reserves for, *Mar. 7*, 639, 640.
  - Reserve, Estimate for, *Mar. 7*, 632, 633
  - Wages of Civilians attached to Units, Explanation of Vote for, *Mar. 2*, 285.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
Irish Industries, Protection of, in British Markets, *Mar. 1*, 23.
Labourers, Condition of, Necessity for Improvement in, *Mar. 1*, 113–116, 120.

Old Age Pensions
Cottew, Mr., Scheme of.
Q. Mr. J. Howard; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 2*, 169.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tram ways Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 3*, 298.

Open Spaces Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 8*, 735.

Orange River Colony
South African War Claims against.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 6*, 392.

Orkney
Sanday, Island of—Establishment of Coastguard Station, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 2*, 164, 165.

Orphan Working School and Alexandra Orphanage Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 10*, 1041.

Oxford
University College—Statute Amending Statute III. Presented, *Mar. 13*, 1131, 1170.

Palmer, Sir C. M. [Durham, Jarrow]
Army—Submarine Mining, Decision as to Discontinuance of—Utilisation of Services of Submarine Miners, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1178.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Bahr-el-Ghazel, Disturbances in, *Mar. 13*, 1172.
Ceylon—Education of Children on Tea Estates, *Mar. 7*, 569.
Cheltenham Town Council Accounts, Audit of, *Mar. 7*, 575.
Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of.
British Consular Representation in the Upper Congo, *Mar. 7*, 570.
Forts, Building of, Increase of Troops, etc., Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1173.
Local Government Board Accounts, Standardisation of—Appointment of Departmental Committee, *Mar. 7*, 575.

Parks and Gardens
[*For particular parks, etc., see their names*, as Hyde Park].

Parliament
House of Commons.
Division Lobbies—Provision of Extra Exits, proposed.
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Mar. 14*, 1380.

Parliament—*cont*
House of Commons—*cont.*
Kitchen Committee, Appointment of, *Mar. 7*, 695.
Ladies' Gallery.
Grating, Removal of, proposed.
O. Mr. O. Williams, *Mar. 14*, 1381.
Ventilation of, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Mar. 14*, 1380, 1381.
Strangers' Gallery, Admittance to, Regulations as to,
Os. Mr. J. H. Lewis, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 10*, 1128.
House of Lords.
Representative Peer for Ireland—Earl of Darnley, *Mar. 13*, 1129.
Sat First—Earl of Northbrook, After the Death of his Father, *Mar. 9*, 857.

Parliamentary Elections
New Members Sworn.
Jones, Mr. L. S., for Westmoreland (Northern or Appleby Division) *Mar. 6*, 432.
Lamont, Mr. N., for the County of Bute, *Mar. 8*, 734.

Parliamentary Procedure
Closure, Regulations as to moving.
Os. Mr. Churchill, Mr. Jeffreys, *Mar. 13*, 1322.
Main Question not Claimed until after Question put from the Chair—Rule as to moving Closure.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 10*, 1126.
Member called upon by the Speaker to move the Order of the Day—Motion "That he be not heard."
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 6* 433, 435; Mr. Speaker, 433–435; Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. G. Bowles, 434; Mr. Lough, 435.
Previous Question used in Connection with a Motion made by Private Member, Legitimacy of.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8*, 824 Lord G. Hamilton, 825; Mr. J Chamberlain, 833; Mr. A. J Balfour, 842.
Private Member securing Place by Ballot for a Motion on going into Supply, Precedence of, over Minister.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. Lough, Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 2*, 203-205; Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 6*, 433, 435; Mr. Speaker, 433, 434, 435; Mr. J. Redmond, 434; Mr. G. Bowles, 434; Mr. Lough, 435.
Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 429, 430.

Partington, Mr. O. [Derbyshire, High Peak]
  Unemployed, Work for, Suggestion as to, *Mar. 1*, 7.
  Volunteer Officers, Schools of Instruction for, *Mar. 13*, 1197.

Pease, J. A. [Essex, Saffron Walden]
  Somaliland Expedition.
    Cession of British Territory, Extent of, etc., *Mar. 14*, 1362.
    Conduct and Cost of Operations, *Mar. 8*, 760, 761.

Peebleshire
  County Council—Clerk acting as Parliamentary Agent, Regulations as to, *Mar. 6*, 413.

Peel, Mr. W. R. W. [Manchester, S.]
  Somaliland Campaign, Conduct of—Future Administration of the Country, etc., *Mar. 7*, 653–656; *Mar. 8*, 742–745.

Percy, Earl—*Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* (Kensington, South]
  Collision and Salvage Laws, Unification of—Report of Brussels International Conference, *Mar. 14*, 1374.
  Colonies — American goods, Preferential Customs Tariff for, *Mar. 9*, 913.
  Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of.
    British Consular Representation in the Upper Congo, *Mar. 7*, 571.
    Commission of Inquiry—Details as to Evidence, *Mar. 6*, 394.
      Treatment of Witnesses, *Mar. 6*, 394, 408.
    Currie, Rev. W. T., Report of—Presentation proposed, *Mar. 6*, 394.
    Forts, Building of, Increase of Troops, etc., Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1173.
  Cuba and United States, Reciprocity Treaty between—Effect on British Trade, *Mar. 1*, 14.
  Egypt.
    Mecca Pilgrims—Theft of Charitable Funds from Mahmal Escort, *Mar. 8*, 713.
    Soudan, *see that subheading.*
  France, Public Works in—Exclusion of Foreign-made Material, *Mar. 1*, 15.
  Macedonia.
    Kuklish, Salonica, Alleged Outrage by Turkish Troops at, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1173, 1184.
    Reform Schemes.
      Despatches to Foreign Countries, Tabling Proposed, *Mar. 1*, 14, 15.
      Reports, Issue of, *Mar. 3*, 320.
      Tithes, Payment of, in Monastir, *Mar. 3*, 319.

Percy, Earl
  Somaliland Expedition.
    Administration of the Country, responsibilities to Tribes, etc—Government Policy, *Mar. 8*, 746–755.
    Arming of Natives, *Mar. 14*, 1375, 1376.
    Cession of British Territory, Extent of, etc., *Mar. 14*, 1362.
    Conduct of Operations, Criticisms on, *Mar. 8*, 746–755.
    Cost of, *Mar. 8*, 746,
      Grants in Aid for, Information as to, *Mar. 1*, 4.
    Indian Garrison, Annual Cost of, Defraying, by British Government, *Mar. 14*, 1374.
    Obligations Towards Tribes, Information as to, *Mar. 14*, 1375, 1376.
  Soudan—Bahr-el-Ghazal, Disturbances in, *Mar. 13*, 1173.
  Turkey.
    Customs Duties, Increase in—Application of Surplus to Carrying out Reforms in Macedonia, proposed, *Mar. 14*, 1375.
    European Provinces of, Tabling Correspondence Relating to, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 919.
    Villages Destroyed by Turkish Troops—Number Rebuilt, *Mar. 9*, 920.
  Women, Employment of, Before and After Childbirth—Restrictions in Foreign Countries, *Mar. 6*, 395.

Perth
  Prison Visiting Committee, Rules as to, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 151.

Peterhead
  Prison Visiting Committee, Rules as to, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 151.

Pettigo
  Magitsracy—Roman Catholic Representation.
      Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar. 8*, 725, 726.
    Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Powers of.
      Q. Mr. S. Macneill; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1171.

Physical Deterioration
  Committee Report and Recommendations, Adoption of, proposed.
      Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Sir J. Gorst, *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 8*, 732, 733.
    Poor Law Officers, Issue of Leaflets to, proposed,
      Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. W Long, *Mar. 7*, 576.

Piers and Harbours
Ireland.
Achill Island—Proposals as to Extension of Pier at Darby's Point.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8*, 705, *Mar. 14*, 1385.
Galway, *see that title.*
Mayo, Marine Works, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1213.
Poulduff Pier, Progress with Reconstruction of.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 564.

Pilkington, Lt.-Col. R. [Lancashire, Newton]
Army Pay, Deferred, Amount of, *Mar. 2*, 266.
Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3*, 347.
Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill Referring, to Standing Committee on Law, proposed, *Mar. 10*, 1121, 1122.

Poisons
Accidents Caused by, Precautions against
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar, 13*, 1191.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13*, 1204.
Sale of by Companies, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1188.

Police and Sanitary Committee
Appointment of, Terms of Reference, etc., *Mar. 2*, 162, 163.

Polling Districts
Middlesex—Division of Parish of Acton into two Districts, Order as to, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 150, 164.

Poor Law
Aliens, Percentage of, in Receipt of Relief.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 8*, 704.
Emigration—Powers of Poor Law Guardians to Assist Destitute Persons to Emigrate.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 2*, 184.
Ireland.
Ballyhaunis Maternity Nurse.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 3*, 320, 321.
Officers' Salaries, Promotions, etc.
Qs. Mr. O'Malley; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 555, 556.
Reform Commission—Date of Presenting Report.
Q. Mr. James O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2*, 187.

Poor Law—*cont.*
Medical Officers—Appointments, Paid, outside Duties under Local Government Board.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *Mar. 13*, 1189, 1190.
Percentage of Total Population in Receipt of Relief.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 8*, 704.
Physical Deterioration Committee Recommendations, Issue of Leaflets on, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 7*, 576.

Portsmouth, Earl of
India, Import Duties in, *Mar. 13*, 1131–1138.

Post Office
Postmaster-General—Lord Stanley.
Addresses—Regulation as to use of English Language and Characters.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 6*, 423–425.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 729, 730.
Dismissal of Officials, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 702.
Ireland.
Aghnacliffe Letter Deliveries.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1361.
Armagh—Case of Mr. R. J. McCusker, *Mar. 6*, 397.
Belfast, *see that title.*
Currygranny Postal Arrangements.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 1*, 28.
Drogheda and Virginia Road, Acceleration of Service between.
Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 728.
Dublin, *see that title.*
Edgeworthstown Parcels Delivery Arrangements.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 1*, 28.
Irish Language, *see that title.*
Limerick—Appointment to Vacancy at Rutland Street.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1186, 1187.
Redford-Moy, Erection of Letter-box at, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 910.
Late-fee Letters, Regulation as to Posting in Special Boxes.
Q. Lord C. Manners; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 911.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
Learners—Appointments (1902–1904.)
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1359, 1360, 1378.
London—Ludgate Hill—Risk Allowance Regulations.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 6*, 397, 398.
Mail Service, Scotland.
Night Mail Service to the North.
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 2*, 165.
West Highlands, Improvement of Service in.
Q. Mr. J. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 923.
Messengers, Night—Pay, Good Conduct Awards, etc.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1186.
Postal Orders, Colonial Amendment (No. 2) Regulations Presented, *Mar. 13*, 1131, 1171.
Postmasters.
Nationality and Religious Denominations of.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 701.
Vacancies, Appointments to, in Ireland.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Farrell; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 939, 940.
Postmen.
Good Conduct Stripes, Forfeited, Rule as to Recovery of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 702.
Gratuity to, on being Incapacitated by Accident—Case of J. Webb.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1362.
Overtime in Dublin Office at Christmas, Payment for.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 7*, 591, 592.
Rural Postmen, rate of pay of,
Qs. Mr. Bright, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 923.
Packets of Printed Papers, Regulations as to weighing, &c.
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 3*, 318, 319; *Mar. 10*, 1048.
Parcels sent Abroad, Stamping so as to Identify Office in Cases of Detention for Insufficient Postage, proposed.
Q. Colonel Welby; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 10*, 1049.
Railway Sub-offices, Municipal Boroughs as.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1361.

Post Office—*cont.*
Relatives of Supervising Officers, Rule as to Employment of.
Q. Mr. Goddard; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 2*, 166.
Risk Allowance at Ludgate Hill Office.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 6*, 397, 398.
Savings Bank, *see that title.*
Scotland.
Dingwall, Enlarged Accommodation at, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1207.
Inverpolly, Postal Facilities at, Extension of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1207.
Mail Service, *see under that subheading.*
Sick Leave Regulations, Case of Mr. Emberson.
Q. Mr. Cremer; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 703.
Telegraph *and* Telephone Services, *see those titles.*
Volunteers in—Facilities for Camp Leave.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 702, 703.
Wages, Bradford Committee on, Report of, Adoption of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti, Sir A. Rollit; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1206, 1207.

Postal Orders
See under Post Office.

Postmaster-General—*Lord Stanley*

Postmasters and Postmen
See under Post Office.

Pouldufl Pier
Reconstruction, Progress with.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 564.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, East]
Navy,
Flogging of Boys in, *Mar. 7*, 618.
Ireland, Contribution by, towards Cost, *Mar. 7*, 618, 619.
Somaliland Expedition, Cost of, *Mar. 8*, 785.
Waterford, Horses in, Outbreak of Epizootic Lymphangitis among, *Mar. 8*, 786.
Compensation for Destruction of Horses, *Mar. 13*, 1219.

President of the Board of Agriculture—*Rt. Hon. A. E. Fellowe.*

President of the Board of Education—*Marquess of Londonderry.*

President of the Board of Trade—*Marquess of Salisbury.*

President of the Local Government Board—*Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.*

Press

- Dissemination of News previous to Outbreak of War and in Time of War, Laws as to.
  - *Os.* Lord Ellenborough, *Mar. 3,* 300, 308, 309, 310; Earl of Selborne, 313, 314; Earl Spencer, 315, 316; Mr. R. Lucas, *Mar. 6,* 460.

Pretyman, Capt. E. G.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Suffolk, Woodbridge]

- Admiralty.
  - Board—Business, Distribution of—Circulation of Statement, *Mar. 6,* 403, 404.
  - First Sea Lord.
    - Office of, Changes in, Information as to, *Mar. 13,* 1258, 1259.
    - Presence of, on Committees, Importance of, *Mar. 6,* 441.
- Armaments, Reductions in, Negotiations with Foreign Powers with a view to, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 465, 466.
- Bases.
  - Defence of, Objections to placing, in Hands of Military Authorities, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1312.
  - New, Organisation of, *Mar. 6,* 437.
- Boilers.
  - Belleville, Intentions as to, *Mar. 14,* 1423.
  - Tubular and Cylindrical , Proportion between, *Mar. 14,* 1422.
- Boy Sailor Scheme—Withdrawal of Grant, Provision for Payment for Boys enrolled in Naval Reserve, *Mar. 8,* 700.
- Clinton Estate, Admiralty Purchase of Land on, *Mar. 1,* 10.
- "Clio" and "Cadmus," Date of laying down, Date of Completion, Cost—Removal from Active List, *Mar. 6,* 403.
- Clyde River, Vessels anchored in, Nuisance caused by, *Mar. 9,* 916, 917; *Mar. 13,* 1199.
- Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 6,* 437; *Mar. 13,* 1250, 1251
- Dockyards.
  - Administration of, Constitution of Committee on, *Mar. 13,* 1256.
  - Expenses Accounts, Change in form of, *Mar. 13,* 1199, 1200.
  - Repairs, Comparative Cost of, in Private and Government Yards, *Mar. 13,* 1257.
- "Dominion," H.M.S., Gun-sights of, New System of Gearing, etc., *Mar. 13,* 1256.
- "Drake," H.M.S., Improvement in Gun-sights of, *Mar. 13,* 1256.
- Education and Training of Officers and men proposals as to, *Mar. 6,* 442.

Pretyman, Capt. E G.—*cont,*

- Effective list and non-effective list, Ships on, *Mar. 6,* 403.
  - Number, Age, Cost, etc., of Vessels struck off, *Mar. 6,* 438; *Mar. 13,* 1316; *Mar. 14,* 1411.
- "Enchantress," Yacht, Cost of, *Mar. 2,* 176; *Mar. 7,* 706.
- Expenditure, Reduction in, *Mar. 6,* 436, 465; *Mar. 13,* 1252–1254.
  - Amount of,actually due to New Scheme, *Mar. 13,* 1252–1254; *Mar. 14,* 1416.
- Estimates—Statement, *Mar. 6,* 435–448.
- Flogging, *Mar. 2,* 175; *Mar. 14,* 1418, 1419, 1441, 1442, 1448.
  - Regulations as to, Explanation of, prior to Engagement, etc., *Mar. 7,* 567.
- Gunnery.
  - Appliances for Shooting, and Training of *personnel,* Improvement in, *Mar. 6,* 443.
  - Fire Control in Action—Adoption of Committee recommendations, *Mar 6,* 443.
  - Inspector of Target Practice for the Fleet, Duties and Emoluments of, etc., *Mar. 6,* 443; *Mar. 13,* 1259, 1260.
  - Night-firing, Facilities for, *Mar. 13,* 1255.
- Gun-sights [[*For particular Vessels, see subheadings names of Vessels.*]
  - Improvement in, *Mar. 6,* 443; *Mar. 13,* 1256.
- "Harrier" and "Barham," H.M.S., Speed and Fishery Duties of, *Mar. 6,* 404.
- Minister of the Crown acting as Chairman, Precedents for, *Mar. 2,* 261.
- Mobility, Importance of, *Mar. 6,* 437.
- Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, *Mar. 6,* 437, 438, 451; *Mar. 8,* 704; *Mar. 13,* 1253; *Mar. 14,* 1421.
  - *See also subheading* Effective.
  - Breaking up in England, *Mar. 13,* 1200.
  - Classification of, *Mar. 13,* 1199.
- Offices.
  - Education and Training of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 6,* 442.
  - Retirement, Compulsory—Reduction of Age, *Mar. 2,* 169.
- Oil Fuel, Use of, *Mar. 14,* 1421–1423.
- Pacific, British position in, *Mar. 14,* 1417.
- *Personnel,* Redistribution of, under the New Scheme, *Mar. 13,* 1311.
- Police Duties of the Fleet, *Mar. 13,* 1252;
- Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 6,* 436.
  - Cost of—Reduction in Expenditure due to, etc., *Mar. 14,* 1416, 1420.

[*cont.*

Pretyman, Capt. E. G.—*cont.*

Promotions, Regulations as to, *Mar. 3*, 320.

Recruiting—Age Regulations, Parental Consent, etc., *Mar. 7*, 606.

Repairs.

Cost of, Comparative, in Private and Government Yards, *Mar. 13*, 1257.

Ships to be struck off Effective List, Estimate for Repairs to, *Mar. 13*, 1232, 1245, 1253.

Reserve, Royal Fleet, present strength of, *Mar. 10*, 1048.

Reserve Squadron, Constitution of, *Mar. 6*, 438, 439.

Return, Part II. of, Date of issuing, *Mar. 9*, 946.

Rosyth Base, Dockyard Works at, Progress made with Policy as to, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1257; *Mar. 14*, 1423.

Shipbuilding.

Designs.

Committee on.

Constitution and Terms of Reference of, *Mar. 13*, 1254, 1255.

Work of, Importance of, *Mar. 6*, 440.

Initial Stages of, Importance of, *Mar. 6*, 439, 440.

Secrecy as to, *Mar. 13*, 1311.

Programme 1905–6, *Mar. 6*, 446, 447.

Estimates for, Discrepancies in, *Mar. 13*, 1254.

Rate of, Acceleration in, Advantages of, etc., *Mar. 6*, 441, 442.

Staff College, Establishment of, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 442, 443.

Stations at Halifax and Esquimault handed over to Canadian Government, *Mar. 13*, 1258; *Mar. 14*, 1416, 1417.

Submarines.

Construction, Information as to, *Mar. 6*, 444, 445.

Cost of, *Mar. 6*, 445.

Value of, for Offensive and Defensive Purposes, etc., *Mar. 6*, 445, 446.

Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Policy of Constructing inferior type of, *Mar. 13*, 1311, 1312; *Mar. 14*, 1421.

Torpedo Boats, Design and Speed of, *Mar. 13*, 1263, 1264.

Volunteers, Value of, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1258.

Prevention of Corruption Bill

l. 1R.* *Mar. 3*, 298.
2R., *Mar. 13*, 1164.

Prime Minister

Right Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Prisons

Aliens in, Number of, etc.
Qs. Sir T. Dewar, Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Mar. 13*, 1203, 1204.

Hair-cutting Regulations for Prisoners under Remand.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 6*, 398, 399.

Ireland—Medical Officers, Appointment of.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14*, 1387.

Scotland, Visiting Committees, Rules as to, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 151.

Private Bills

Police and Sanitary Regulations, Committee for—Appointment and Terms of Reference, *Mar. 2*, 162, 163.

Privileges Committee

Nomination of Members, *Mar. 13*, 1331.

Prize Courts Bill

l. 1R.* *Mar. 9*, 900.
2R., *Mar. 13*, 1166.

Public Accounts Committee

Army Stores, Sale of, Report as to.
Q. Sir A. Hayter, *Mar. 2*, 218, 219.

Duties of, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 1*, 64; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 87, 88.

Report, Date of discussing.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1229, 1230.

Public Buildings (Expenses) Act 1898 Fund

Consols sold under, Account of.
Q. Mr. Cohen; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 6*, 409.

Public Health Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 1*, 29.

Public Libraries Acts (Extension) Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 1*, 29.

Public Meetings (Facilities) Bill

l. 1R.* *Mar. 9*, 863.

Public Offices Acts

Accounts Presented, *Mar. 3*, 317.

Public Petitions Committee

Nomination of Members, *Mar. 13*, 1331.

Public Records

See Records, Public.

Public Trustee and Executor Bill

c. 2R. *Mar. 3*, 374.

Debate on Second Reading (Commons) *Mar. 3*, 374.

Bill of 1890, 374, 376.

Breach of Trust, Number of Cases of, Necessity for Legislation, etc., 374, 375.

[*cont.*

Public Trustee and Executor Bill—*cont.*

Debate on Second Reading—cont.

Judicial Trust (Scotland) Act, Terms of, 374.

New Zealand Act, Bill modelled on, 375.

Office of Public Trustee, Provision for Abolition of, 376.

Purvis, Mr. R. [Peterborough]

Africa, South—Appointment of Lord Selborne as High Commissioner, *Mar. 6,* 493, 494.

Trade, Board of—Appointment of Lord Salisbury as President, *Mar. 13,* 1292.

Queen Anne's Bounty

Accounts and Report Presented, *Mar. 1,* 3; *Mar. 2,* 150.

Questions

Rulings as to, *see under* Speaker.

Railways

Accidents—Information for 1904, Date of Presenting Return, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *Mar. 14,* 1364.

Derailments of Tender-Engines drawing Passenger Trains, Return as to, proposed.
Q. Col. Lockwood; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 10,* 1049, 1050.

Electric.

Accidents from live rail, Number and prevention of.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 7,* 573, 574.

Backworth, Fatality at.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 1,* 15.

North Eastern Railway, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. B. Law, *Mar. 14,* 1378, 1379.

District Railway, Electrification of—Provision as to Driver's Assistant.
Q. Mr. Atherley-Jones; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 9,* 907.
Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 10,* 1049.

Servants—Hours of Labour, Reduction of
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *Mar. 2,* 170.

Randles, Mr. J. S. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]

Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R., *Mar. 10,* 1090–1091.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]

Army Uniforms, Information as to changes in, *Mar. 2,* 177.

Ex-soldiers, Employment of, in Government Offices, *Mar. 13,* 1179.

Somaliland Expedition—Conduct of Operations, *Mar. 8,* 759, 760.

Rasharkin

Constabulary Force, Transfer of.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 193, 194.

Rathclive Grazing Farm

Purchase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 193.

Rathmines and Rathgar Eztension and Improvement Bill

c. 2R., *Mar. 9,* 1009.

Debate on Second Reading [Commons] *Mar. 9,* 1009.

Annexation of Districts, Objections to, 1009, 1010, 1013.

Dublin

Public Bodies, Objections of, to the Bill, 1011, 1012, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1020.

Water Supply and Drainage Schemes, interference with, 1011, 1012, 1014–1020.

Indebtedness of Rathmines Urban Council, 1010, 1013.

Referring Bill to Committee, proposed, 1017, 1029.

Objects of the Bill, 1009.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]

Canada—Withdrawal of Garrisons from—Tabling Correspondence proposed, *Mar. 2,* 182.

Reay, Lord

India, Import Duties in, *Mar. 13,* 1146–1151.

Reckitt, Mr. H. J.—[Lincolnshire, Brigg]

Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 347.

Record Office, Public

Army List and Muster Rolls, Conditions of Transfer of, from War Office.
Q. Col. Welby; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9,* 916.

Records, Public

Estate Duty Office—List of Documents of insufficient Value to justify Preservation, Presented, *Mar. 14,* 1358.

Redford-Moy

Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9,* 910.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]

- Chief Secretary for Ireland, Date of Appointing, *Mar. 9*, 942.
- Distress in Ireland, Cause of, and Method of Dealing with, *Mar. 14*, 1468, 1483, 1484, 1486–1489.
- Irish Language, Parcels, etc., Addressed in, Delay of, *Mar. 6*, 423, 424.
- Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Car Scheme, Progress made with, *Mar. 2*, 187, 188; *Mar. 9*, 930.
- Labourers, Condition of, Improvement in, Failure of the Government to Deal with, *Mar. 1*, 124–126.
- Land Act, 1903.
  - Estates Commissioners.
    - Administration by, *Mar. 13*, 1212.
    - Instructions and Regulations issued to—Tabling, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 979, 980.
    - Section 5 of the Act, Interpretation and Administration of, *Mar. 9*, 973.
  - Evicted Tenants, Progress made in Re-instatement of, *Mar. 7*, 669–672.
  - Towns and Villages, Purchase of, *Mar. 6*, 417, 418.
  - Working of, Reports as to, *Mar. 7*, 669, 670.
- MacDonnell, Sir A.
  - Censure of, by the Cabinet.
    - Correspondence with Chief Secretary, Cognisance of, by Members of Cabinet, *Mar. 13*, 1224.
    - Explanation of Actions, Opportunity for, *Mar. 6*, 425, 426.
  - Conditions of Appointment, *Mar. 13* 1226.
- Parliamentary Procedure—Member called upon by the Speaker to move the Order of the Day—Motion "That he be not heard," *Mar. 6*, 434.
- Rochfort Bridge, Estate of Mrs. Maher, Purchasers of, *Mar. 6*, 417.
- Select Committees on Railway Bills, Appointment of Railway Directors to act on, *Mar. 14*, 1382.
- Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14*, 1396, 1397, 1503, 1505.
- Woodville—Investigation of alleged outrage at house of Mr. Persse, *Mar. 9*, 934.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools

- Ireland—Monaghan Industrial School, Children sent to, from Lisnaskea Petty Sessions.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 7*, 564.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]

- Africa, South.
  - Garrison in.
    - Constabulary Duty done by, alleged, *Mar. 2*, 254.
    - Number of Troops required, *Mar. 2*, 241.
  - Railways taken over by the Military, Payment for, *Mar. 1*, 17.
- Army—Reduction in Numbers, proposed, *Mar. 2*, 241.
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 372.
- Criminal Appeal, Establishment of Court of, proposed, *Mar. 8*, 731.
- Estimates.
  - Committee to Examine and Report on, prior to Discussion, proposed, *Mar. 1*, 55, 56.
  - Discussion of, Inadequate Facilities for, *Mar. 1*, 55.
- Financial Position of the Country, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1*, 54–59.
- National Debt, Position of, *Mar. 1*, 56, 57.
- Navy Expenditure, Increase in, possibility of Reduction, etc., *Mar. 1*, 58.
- Somaliland Expedition Expenditure on, *Mar. 8*, 789.
- South African War, Cost of, Increase in Supplementary Estimates due to, etc., *Mar. 2*, 222.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]

- Estate Duty—Authority of Officials to interpret Section 21 (1) of Statute *Mar. 10*, 1052.
- Poisons, Sale of, by Companies, Regulations as to, *Mar. 13*, 1188.

Renwick, Mr. G. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]

- Army Pay, Deferred, Amount of, *Mar. 2*, 263, 264.

Reserve Forces Bill

- *l.* 3R.* *Mar. 2*, 161.

Revenue Department

- Vote on Account—Estimate Presented, *Mar. 6*, 390.

Revenue and Expenditure

- Accounts—Revision of present System of keeping and presenting, proposed.
  - *Os.* Sir E Vincent, *Mar. 1*, 50, 51; Sir R. Reid, 54; Mr. G. Bowles, 61–65; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 84, 85.
- Appropriations-in-Aid, System of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Guest, *Mar. 1*, 43; Mr. G. Bowles, 63, 64, 66; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 88; Mr. Davenport, *Mar. 2*, 207.

[*cont.*

Revenue and Expenditure—*cont.*
Capital Expenditure a misleading term.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 1,* 67.
Capital Liabilities Increase in.
O. Sir R. Reid, *Mar. 1,* 57.
Collection and Expenditure, Return as to, Ordered, *Mar. 8,* 700.
Commission on National Finance, Report and Recommendations of.
O. Sir E. Vincent, *Mar. 1,* 52.
Condition of the Revenue in 1894 and in 1904–5.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 33; Mr. McCrae, 75.
Control over, by the House of Commons.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 35, 37; Mr. Guest, 43, 44; Sir E. Vincent, 53; Sir R. Reid, 55; Mr. G. Bowles, 60; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 92, 93.
Deficits, Method of meeting.
Qs. Mr. McCrae; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 8,* 713, 714.
Financial Position of the Country—Government Policy, etc.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 31–42; Mr. Guest, 42, 45; Sir E. Vincent, 49, 53, 54; Sir R. Reid, 56, 57; Mr. G. Bowles, 59–61; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 79–91; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 91–94; Mr. K. Hardie, 94–96.
Germany, Estimated Expenditure of.
O. Mr. McCrae, *Mar. 1,* 76.
Growth of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 32, 33; Mr. Guest, 42; Mr. McCrae, 75; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 79–83.
Chancellor of the Exchequer, Responsibility of.
Os. Mr. Guest, *Mar. 1,* 43; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 79; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 93, 94.
Loan Bills, Objections to System of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 36, 37; Sir E. Vincent, 51; Sir R. Reid, 57; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 86.
Proposals involving increased Expenditure constantly urged by Private Members.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 1,* 82, 83, 91; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 91, 92; Mr. K. Hardie, 94.
Public Accounts Committee—Duties of, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar. 1,* 64; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 87, 88.
Reduction in, Necessity for.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 41; Mr. K. Hardie, 95.
South African War.
Financial effects of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 34; Mr. Guest, 45; Sir R. Reid, 57; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 80, 81.

Revenue and Expenditure—*cont.*
South African War—*cont.*
Taxes due to, Policy of continuing in Times of Peace.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 34, 35.
Supplementary Budgets, Objections to System of.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 35.
Taxation, *see that title.*
Taxes, Yield of, in 1894 and in 1904–5.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1,* 33.

Rhodesia
Murray, Late James, Sum of Money left by.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8,* 712.
Railways taken over by the Military, Payment for.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 1,* 3.

Ridley, Vis.
India, Import Duties in, *Mar. 13,* 1151–1154.

Rifle Clubs
Government assistance to, Use ot Government Ranges, etc.
Q. Mr. F. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 10,* 1054.

Rifle Ranges
Whitchurch (Glos.)—Cost, Decision as to Abandonment, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9,* 918, 919.

Ripon, Marquess of
Cabinet Meetings, Attendance of Minister at, Prior to taking Office and being sworn of the Privy Council, *Mar. 9,* 864.
Fiscal Policy—Question of Retaliation, *Mar. 13,* 1161, 1162.
India, Import Duties in, *Mar. 13,* 1158–1162.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, West]
India.
Bombay University Provisional Syndicate, Rules for Election of, *Mar. 9,* 914, 915.
Police Commission—Adoption of Report and Recommendations, *Mar. 6,* 407.
Navy.
Armaments, Reductions in, Negotiations with Foreign Powers with a View to, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 457–459.
Expenditure.
Reduction of, *Mar. 6,* 456.
Relation of, to Taxation of the Country *Mar. 6,* 457, 458.
Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 6,* 456, 457.

[*cont.*

Roberts, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*
- Somaliland Expedition—Indian Garrison, Annual Cost of, Defraying, by British Government, *Mar. 14*, 1374.
- Tibet, Treaty with—Appointment of Chinese Plenipotentiary, *Mar. 6*, 406.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
- Volunteers—Issue of Field Guns to Fourth West York Artillery, *Mar. 14*, 1366.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
- Admiralty Board, Distribution of Business at—Circulation of Statement, *Mar. 6*, 403, 404.
- Navy.
  - Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 13*, 1231, 1241–1243.
  - Expenditure.
    - Reduction in, *Mar. 13*, 1244.
    - Total Estimated, for 1905–6, *Mar. 6*, 449, 450.
  - Flogging in, *Mar. 14*, 1442.
  - Obsolete Ships.
    - Effective and Non-effective list, Number, Age, Cost, etc., of Vessels struck off, *Mar. 6*, 403, 449; *Mar. 13*, 1231, 1232, 1244.
    - Elimination of, Proposals as to, *Mar. 13*, 1231, 1244.
  - Policy, Change in, Cost of, *Mar. 13*, 1244.
  - Repairs—Ships to be struck off Effective list, Estimate for Repairs to, *Mar. 13*, 1232, 1245, 1246.
  - Scouts, Construction of, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1248.
  - Shipbuilding.
    - Designs, Committee on, Constitution and Terms of Reference of, *Mar. 13*, 1249.
    - Programme 1905–6, Estimates for, Discrepancies in, *Mar. 13*, 1246–1248.
  - Submarines.
    - Cost of, *Mar. 6*, 445.
    - Estimate for, Information as to, *Mar. 13*, 1248.
- Navy Estimates.
  - Date of taking of, *Mar. 2*, 202, 203; *Mar. 3*, 384; *Mar. 6*, 431; *Mar. 8*, 734.
  - Discussion on, *Mar. 13*, 1229.
  - Reduction, Amount of, actually due to New Scheme, *Mar. 13*, 1244
- Somaliland Expedition, Estimate for Cost of, *Mar. 2*, 232.
- Army Pay, Deferred, Amount of, *Mar. 2*, 264, 265.
- Evicted Tenants, Ireland, Re-instatement of, *Mar. 7*, 667–669.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, East]
- Clanricarde Estate—Disputes between Landlord and Tenants, *Mar. 7*, 661–666.
- Comyn Kenny Estate Grazing Lands, Disposal of, *Mar. 1*, 9; *Mar 6*, 419.
- Distress in Ireland, Cause of, and Method of Dealing with, *Mar 14*, 1485.
- Evicted Tenants, Re-instatement of, under Land Act of 1903, *Mar. 7*, 659–666
- Galway, W. T., Estate of—Purchase, proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1177.
- Longworth Estate, Acreage of, Delay in Disposal of Lands, etc., *Mar. 9*, 929.
- Segrave Estate Grazing Lands, Disposal of, *Mar. 13*, 1216.

Rollit, Sir A. K. [Islington, South]
- Commerce, Ministry of—Date of Introduction of Bill, *Mar. 8*, 733.
- Estimates, Date of taking, *Mar. 6*, 431.
- Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 377, 379, 380.
- Post Office—Bradford Committee Report. Adoption of, proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1207.
- Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R, *Mar. 3*, 327–330.
- Submarine Mining, Discontinuance of, by the Army—Utilisation of Services of Officers, etc., of Mining Divisions, *Mar. 6*, 405.
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney-General for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9*, 1034.

Ropner, Col. Sir E. H. O. R. [Stockton]
- Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 345.

Rosebery, Earl of
- Mr. Wyndham, Resignation of, *Mar. 6*, 387.

Rosyth Naval Base
- *see under* Navy.

Rotherham, Maltby, and Laughton Railway Bill
- c. 2R.* *Mar. 9*, 900.

Rotten Row
- *see under* Hyde Park.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Dewsbury]
- Business of the House—Standing Order as to Business after one o'clock A.M., *Mar. 1*, 147.
- Navy.
  - Boilers—Adoption of Belleville Type, *Mar. 14*, 1423.
  - Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 13*, 1251, 1279–1281.
  - Dockyards — Repairs, Comparative Cost of, in Private and Government Dockyards, *Mar. 13*, 1279.
  - Obsolete Ships, Elimination of, *Mar. 13*, 1281.

[*cont.*

Runciman, Mr. T. W.—*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Police Duties of the Fleet, *Mar. 13*, 1251.

Policy, Changes in, *Mar. 13*, 1277, 1278.

Rosyth Base, Dockyard Works at, Progress made with, Policy as to, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1277.

Strength—Comparison with Fleets of Germany, France and United States, *Mar. 13*, 1280, 1281.

Vaccination Fees, Report of Departmental Committee on—Date of Presentation, *Mar. 7*, 559.

Wyndham, Mr., Resignation of, *Mar. 6*, 528.

Russell, Mr. T. W. (Tyrone, South)

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill, Date of Introduction of, *Mar. 13*, 1218.

De Freyne Estate, Sale of—Progress of Negotiations, *Mar. 8*, 727.

Education—National School Teachers, Promotions of, *Mar. 9*, 910.

Land Act, 1903.

Compulsory Powers of Purchase by Congested Districts Board, Reason for not Pressing for, *Mar. 14*, 1489.

Estates Commissioners.

Instructions and Regulations issued to, Tabling, *Mar. 9*, 952–953, 958.

Report of, Form of, *Mar. 13*, 1222.

Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement of, *Mar. 7*, 688–690.

Working of, Reports as to, etc., *Mar. 7*, 687, 688; *Mar. 9*, 953–956.

Land Purchase advances, Delay in placing Loans, etc., *Mar. 9*, 971.

MacDonnell, Sir A., Conditions of Appointment of, *Mar. 13*, 1225.

Postal Service between Ulster and London, Improvement of, *Mar. 13*, 1220.

Rathmines and Rathgar Extension and Improvement Bill, 2R. *Mar. 9*, 1020.

Redford-Moy Postal facilities, Improvement of, *Mar. 9*, 910.

Woodville—Investigation of alleged outrage at house of Mr. Persse, *Mar. 9*, 933, 934; *Mar. 13*, 1216, 1217.

Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney General, for not setting Public Prosecution in motion, *Mar. 9*, 1027, 1028.

Russia

Navy—Information as to Vessels built and building, etc., Return ordered, *Mar. 6*, 391.

Russia—*cont.*

Sugar—Treaty with Germany, Provisions of. *Q.* Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1200, 1201.

Russo-Japanese War

British Officers attached to Belligerent Forces.

Duties of, and Subjects to be Reported on, etc.

O. Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, *Mar. 2*, 210–212.

Expenditure sanctioned for, Indian Contributions for, etc.

Os. Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, *Mar. 2*, 210; Mr. B. Davenport, 214, 224; Captain Norton, 223, 224, Mr. Churchill, 224, 227.

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford [Northants, North]

Galleries, National and Tate, Lighting of *Mar. 3*, 317.

St. Albans, Bishop of

Newcastle Chapter Amendment) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 6*, 387.

St. Lucia

Naval Station at, Abandonment of. *O.* Mr. C. Wason, *Mar. 6*, 520.

Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill

l. 2R. *Mar. 7*, 531.

Com. and *Rep.** *Mar. 9*, 889.

3R.* *Mar. 10*, 1042.

c. 1R.* *Mar. 13*, 1332.

Sale of Whisky Bill

c. 1R.* *Mar. 14*, 1398.

Salisbury, Marquess of—*President of the Board of Trade* and *Lord Privy Seal.*

Fiscal Policy—Question of Retaliation, *Mar. 13*, 1164.

Samuel, Mr. H. L. [Yorkshire, Cleveland]

Africa, South—Native Affairs, Commission on—Tabling Report, *Mar. 9*, 904.

British Empire, Omissions from Statistical Abstract of, *Mar. 7*, 557.

Congo Free State, Employment in—Warning to native workmen issued by Government of Lagos, *Mar. 8*, 713.

Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 379.

Poor Law Relief, Percentage of Aliens and of total population in receipt of, *Mar. 8*, 704.

Railways, Electric—Accidents from live rail, Number and Prevention of, *Mar. 7*, 573.

Samuel, Sir H. S. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]

Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 323–327.

Sandes, Mr. Collis, Estate of

Sale, Terms of, etc.

Qs. Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 6*, 415.

Savings Banks
  Balance Sheet, etc., Preparation of—Powers of National Debt Commissioners—Consulting as to repeal of portion of Act, etc.
    Qs. Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 7*, 571; *Mar. 14*, 1376, 1377.
  Consols purchased by (1894–1899).
    Qs. Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 920.
  Depositors' Accounts.
    Explanation of Origin of Account, Power of Registrar of Friendly Societies to demand.
      Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 715.
      Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1205.
    Inspection of, by the Public, etc.
      Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 715.
      Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1206, 1207.
  Deposits.
    Evasions of limit of.
      Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 922.
    Interest on, Reduction of, Rate of proposed.
      Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 9*, 921.
  Income Account, Deficiency in—Measures proposed to render Bank self-supporting.
    Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 7*, 571, 572.
  Trustee—Report of Proceedings of Inspection Committee, Presented, *Mar. 13*, 1131, 1171.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]
  Indian Budget—Increase of Expenditure under Military Services, *Mar. 2*, 172.

Scotland
  Secretary—Marquess of Linlithgow.
  Lord Advocate—Right Hon. C. Scott-Dickson.
  Solicitor-General—Mr. E. T. Salvesen.
  Church Property Dispute—Recommendations of Commissioners disregarded by Free Church Representatives.
    Q. Mr. Asquith; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 14*, 1394.
  Congested Districts Board, *see that title.*
  Crofters Act, Extension of, to Leaseholders—Culloden Estate Tenants' Resolution, etc.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 1*, 19.

Scotland—*cont.*
  Ecclesiastical Buildings, Rating of—Exemption of Parish Churches in remote Districts proposed.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 13*, 1210.
  Equivalent Grant, Disposal of.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 1*, 19.
  Fisheries, *see that title.*
  Mail Service, *see under* Post Office—Mail Service.
  Milk Supply—Government Inspection of Stock.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 7*, 579.
  Motor Traffic, Heavy, Regulation for.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 2*, 186.
  Physical Deterioration Committee recommendations, issuing to Parochial Officers, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson *Mar. 6*, 412.

Seaham Gas Bill
  c. 2R.* *Mar. 13*, 1168.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
  Rt. Hon. A. Lyttelton.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
  Marquess of Lansdowne.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
  Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas.

Secretary of State for India
  Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick.

Secretary (Chief) for Ireland
  Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.

Secretary for Scotland
  Marquess of Linlithgow.

Secretary of State for War
  Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Isle of Wight]
  Africa, South, High Commissioner of—Appointment of Lord Selborne, *Mar. 6*, 511–513.
  Army.
    Establishment, *Mar. 9*, 918.
    Recruiting and Enlistment—Annual number of Recruits required under Nine Years' System, etc., *Mar. 9*, 917.
    Reorganisation proposals, *Mar. 7*, 639.
  Army Estimates.
    Date of taking, *Mar. 9*, 946.
    Discussion of, Facilities for, *Mar. 14*, 1508, 1509.
  Navy—Obsolete Ships, Disposal of, *Mar. 8*, 704.
  Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14*, 1508.

Seely, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
Motors—Prohibiting use of Patent Whistle, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 906.

Segrave Estate
Grazing Lands, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1216.

Selborne, Earl of
Appointment of, as High Commissioner for South Africa, *see under* Africa, South.
Defence of the Empire.
Dissemination of news previous to outbreak of War, Law as to, *Mar. 3*, 313, 314.
Invasion, preparedness for, etc., *Mar. 3*, 311–314.

Select Committees
See under Committees.

Shaw, Mr. T. F. C. E. [Stafford]
Education (Scotland) Bill, Intro., *Mar. 8*, 739.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, South]
Drogheda and Virginia Road, Improvement of Service between, *Mar. 8*, 728.
Education.
Schools, Model—Disposal of Fees, *Mar. 1*, 26.
Technical Instruction, Funds available for, etc., *Mar. 8*, 722.

Sheffield University Bill
l. 2R.*, *Mar. 14*, 1333.

Shetland
Telegraph Service, Interruptions in.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 2*, 166.

Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill
c. 2R., *Mar. 3*, 323.
Debate on Second Reading (Commons) *Mar. 3*, 323.
Actions *in personam* to be carried out in same manner as actions *in rem*, proposed, 326, 327, 329, 331, 335, 337.
Attachment of Ships — additional penalty inflicted on British Shipowners by proposal, 331, 339, 340, 342, 343, 348.
County Courts possessing Admiralty Jurisdiction, Powers of, 330.
Detention of Ships on frivolous charges, Dangers of, 331, 337, 339, 345.
Difficulties of enforcing the present law on foreign Shipowners, 325 326, 328, 333, 334, 341, 342, 347, 348.
Guarantee for Payment of claim, Exaction of, proposed, 338, 341, 346.
Lightermen, Application of the Bill to, 341.

Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill—*cont.*
Debates on Second Reading—cont.
Limitation of Jurisdiction of Act, necessity for, 336, 337, 343.
"Lochness," S. S., Case of, 326.
Necessity for the Measure, 329, 330, 336.
Passengers, Application of the Bill to, 336, 340.
Recovery of damage under Workmen's Compensation Act, possibility of, 343.
Scotch Law as to Compensation, 338.
Whitewood *v.* Andorsen Becker & Co., Case of, 325,
Workmen, Injuries to, Liability of Shipowners of all nationalities to provide Compensation for, 323–328, 330–334, 337, 340, 342, 344, 345, 347, 348.

Shop Clubs Bill
c. 1R.*. *Mar. 7*, 600.

Siam
Convention between United Kingdom and France as to, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 150.

Skibbereen
Jennings, Dr., Farm of, Land Commission Valuation of.
Q. Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 14*, 1386.

Slack, Mr. J. B. [Herts, St. Albans]
Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill 2.R, *Mar. 3*, 381.

Sligo
Distress in—Result of Local Government Board Investigations.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8*. 724.
Marine Works, Funds for.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13*, 1214.
Public Works, Funds available for.
Qs. Mr. W. McKillop; Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8*, 724, 725.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, South]
Belfast.
Post Office.
Mail Service with London, Improvement of, *Mar. 13*, 1219, 1220.
Staff, Pay of, *Mar. 2*, 167.
Victoria Barracks—Closing of Trainfield Gate, *Mar. 13*, 1179.
Constabulary, R. I.—Charges against Constable M'Garry, *Mar. 2*, 191; *Mar. 7*, 565.
Conventual and Monastic Institutions, Inspection of, *Mar. 13*, 1202.

[*cont.*

Sloan, Mr. T. H.—*cont.*

- Crimean War—Claim of Ex-Sergeant Martin for Increase of Pension, *Mar. 14,* 1369.
- Dublin Metropolitan Police—Alleged Refusal of Sergeant Booth to investigate Theft from man named Hannon, *Mar. 9,* 908.
- Education.
  - Manual Instructress qualified to act as Assistant Mistresses, Number employed, Rate of Remuneration, etc., *Mar. 10,* 1052.
  - National School Teachers, Pensions of, *Mar. 2,* 175, 198 ; *Mar. 10,* 1053.
  - Rules, New, Date of Issue of, *Mar. 13,* 1177.
  - Schools.
    - Amalgamation of Boys' and Girls' Schools, and joint Infant Department, proposed, *Mar. 14,* 1366.
    - Model School Fees, Disposal of, *Mar. 7,* 558, 564.
- Kildalkey Constabulary Barracks, Disestablishment of, *Mar. 13,* 1177.
- Kings' Own Scottish Borderers, 1st Battalion—Cost of moving from Belfast to Newry, etc., *Mar. 14,* 1366.
- Labourers, Condition of, Necessity for Improvement in, etc., *Mar. 1,* 118–120.
- Lisnaskea Petty Sessions—Children sent to Monaghan Female Industrial School, *Mar. 7,* 564.
- MacDonnell, Sir A., Conditions of Acceptance of Office by, Retention of Services, etc., *Mar. 9,* 941 ; *Mar. 13,* 1226.
- Monaghan Lunatic Asylum—Case of Nurse Holland, *Mar. 9,* 925.
- Postmasterships, Appointments to, in Ireland, *Mar. 9,* 939.
- Postmen, Rural, Wages of, *Mar. 9,* 923.

Smith, Mr. H. C. [Northumberland, Tyneside]

- Kuklish, Salonica, Alleged Outrage by Turkish Troops at, *Mar. 13,* 1184.

Smith, Mr. S. [Flintshire]

- India, Affairs of, Opportunity for Discussing, *Mar. 7,* 595.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster]

- City of London (Escape from Fire) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 14,* 1461.

Soane's Museum

- Funds—Statement Presented, *Mar. 8,* 699 ; *Mar. 9,* 862.

Soares, Mr. E. [Devon, Barnstaple]

- Fiscal Policy.
  - Colonial Conference, Subjects to be discussed at, *Mar. 13,* 1227.
  - Food, Taxation of—Mr. Churchill's *Motion,* Government Attitude towards, *Mar. 7,* 696.

Soares, Mr. E.—*cont.*

- Navy—"Clio" and "Cadmus," Date of Laying Down, Date of Completion, Removal from Active List, etc., *Mar. 6,* 402.
- Trade, Board of—President—Appointment of Marquess of Salisbury, *Mar. 13,* 1230, 1287–1290.
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of—Responsibility of Attorney-General for not setting Public Prosecutor in motion, *Mar. 9,* 1027.

Solicitor-General

Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. Carson.

Solicitor-General for Ireland

J. H. M. Campbell.

Solicitor-General for Scotland

Mr. E. T. Salvesen.

Somaliland Expedition

- Administration of the Country, Government Policy as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 7,* 650, 651 ; Mr. Peel, 654–656 ; *Mar. 8,* 742–745 ; Earl Percy, 746–755 ; Mr. Lloyd-George, 755–759 ; Mr. Malcolm, 762 ; Mr. J. Burns, 763–768 ; Mr. Labouchere, 769 – 771 ; Maj. E. Gordon, 772–774 ; Mr. Bryce, 774–778 ; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 778–782 ; M . Buxton, 782–785 ; Mr. Lyell, 787–789 ; Mr. J. Walton, 790–792.
  - Transfer of, to Indian Government, proposed.
    - *Os.* Mr. Peel, Mr. Lough, *Mar. 8,* 744 ;
- Arming of Natives, Prohosals as to.
  - *Os.* Earl Percy ; *Mar. 8,* 752, 753 ; Mr. Lloyd-George, 755, 756 ; Mr. J. A. Pease, 761 ; Mr. Malcolm, 762 ; Mr. J. Burns, 766 ; Mr. Labouchere, 770; Maj. E. Gordon, 773 ; Mr. Bryce, 777, 778 ; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 782 ; Mr. Lyell, 788.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lyell, Mr. C. Wason ; *As.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 14,* 1375, 1376.
- Cession of British Territory, Extent of, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. A. Pease ; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 14,* 1362.
- Coast, Patrolling of, Arrangements as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Peel, *Mar. 8,* 745 ; Earl Percy, 753, 754.
- Cost of.
  - Estimate for.
    - *Os.* Mr. B. Davenport, *Mar. 2,* 207, 208 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 226 ; Mr. E. Robertson, 232 ; Mr. Arnold - Forster, 233 Earl Percy, *Mar. 8,* 746.

Somaliland Expedition—*cont.*
Cost of—*cont.*
Foreign Office Expenditure.
Os. Mr. B. Davenport, *Mar. 2,* 207; Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 7,* 649.
Grants in Aid for, Information as to.
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 1,* 3, 4.
Information as to.
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 1,* 9.
Total Cost, 1902–5.
Os. Mr. B. Davenport, *Mar. 2,* 207; Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 7,* 649, 650; Mr. Trevelyan, 652; Earl Percy, Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. J. Ellis, *Mar. 8,* 746; Mr. J. A. Pease, 760, 761; Mr. Bryce, 776, 777; Mr. Power, 786; Mr. J. Walton, 790–792.
Qs. Mr. Whitley, Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Buchanan; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 180.

Finality of the Settlement, Whereabouts of the Mullah, etc.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 7,* 651, 652; Mr. Peel, 655; *Mar. 8,* 742; Earl Percy, 754; Mr. Bryce, 776.

History of—Conduct of Operations, etc.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 7,* 647–650; Mr. Trevelyan, 651–563; Mr. Peel, 653–656; *Mar. 8,* 742–745; Earl Percy, 746–755; Mr. Lloyd-George, 755–759; Sir C. Rasch, 759, 760; Mr. J. A. Pease, 760, 761; Mr. J. Burns, 764–767; Mr. Bryce, 775–778; Mr. Arnold-Forster 780–782; Mr. Marks, 786, 787.

Indian Garrison, Annual Cost of, Defraying by British Government.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 14,* 1374.

Italian Co-operation, Extent of.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 7,* 647, 649; Mr. Peel, *Mar. 8,* 742, 743, 745; Earl Percy, 748; Mr. Labouchere, 769.

Obligations towards Tribes, Information as to.
Os. Mr. Peel, *Mar. 8,* 742, 745; Earl Percy, 750–753, 775; Mr. Lloyd-George, 755, 756; Mr. Malcolm, 762; Maj. E. Gordon, 773; Mr. Bryce, 775; Mr. Buxton, 783–785; Sir R. Reid, 789.
Qs. Mr. Lyell; *As.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 14,* 1375, 1376.

Permanent Garrison, Arrangements for.
O. Earl Percy, *Mar. 8,* 753.

Stores for, Re-sale of, to India, Information as to.
O. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Mar. 2,* 220.

Soudan
Bahr-el-Ghazal, Information as to Disturbances in.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 13,* 1172, 1173.

South African War
Cape Colony Customs Duties—Claim for Rebate on Articles purchased during the War.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 176.

Claims against Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 6,* 392.

Compensation Claims—*see* Africa, South, War Compensation Claims.

Cost of, Increase in Supplementary Estimate due to, etc.
Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 2,* 219; Mr. Arnold-Forster, Sir R. Reid, 222.

Medals struck for Issue to Natives returned to the Mint and broken up.
O. Dr. Macnamara, *Mar. 14,* 1370.

Stores and Supplies.
Ammunition, Defective, Value of, Source of Supply, etc.
O. Capt. Norton, *Mar. 14,* 1370.

Jam Contract —Deficiency in Weight supplied, etc.
Q. Sir J. Woodhouse; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1181, 1182.

Report of Comptroller and Auditor-General as to.
Os. Dr. Macnamara, *Mar. 14,* 1369, 1370, 1371; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1370, 1371; Sir H. Fowler 1370.

Discussion Date of.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour *Mar. 13,* 1229.

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 7,* 529.

South Metropolitan Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 2.

South Suburban Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 2.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 13,* 1168.

Southampton and Winchester Great Western Junction Railway (Abandonment) Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 1.
Report by Board of Trade Presented, *Mar. 8,* 699.

Southend and Colchester Light Railways Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *Mar. 3*, 297.

Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory
- *See under* Army—Ordnance Factories.

Speaker
- Business of the House—Exempted Business carried over One o'clock, A.M.—Standing Order as to other Business, *Mar. 1*, 147.
- Chair, Reflections upon, out of Order, *Mar. 14*, 1507.
- Discussion of Opinions expressed in Debate after Termination of Debate, out of Order, *Mar. 10*, 1122.
- Imputations on Members during Debate, *Mar. 6*, 512.
- Main Question not claimed until after Question put from the Chair—Rule as to moving Closure, *Mar. 10*, 1126.
- Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *Mar. 6*, 460, 462, 464; *Mar. 13*, 1306.
- Navy Estimates—Motion that the Question be now put, *Mar. 7*, 621.
- Parliamentary Procedure.
  - Member called upon by the Speaker to Move the Order of the Day—Motion, "That he be not heard," *Mar. 6*, 433–435.
  - Private Member securing Place by Ballot for a Motion on going into Supply, Precedence of, over Minister, *Mar. 2*, 204, 205; *Mar. 6*, 433–435.
- Questions.
  - Answers.
    - Discussion on, *Mar. 9*, 936, 937.
    - Reference to Reply given Three Years ago, *Mar. 7*, 582.
  - Refusal of, by Minister, *Mar. 13*, 1216.
  - Debate on, out of Order, *Mar. 14*, 1382.
  - Form of Question of which Private Notice has been given, *Mar. 2*, 202.
  - Irrelevant Observations, *Mar. 1*, 23; *Mar. 9*, 938; 942, 944; *Mar. 13*, 1227.
  - Notice to be given of, *Mar. 8*, 726.
  - Private Member, addressing Question to, which is not on Order Paper, *Mar. 14*, 1383.
  - Repeating after Answer given, *Mar. 7*, 594; *Mar. 14*, 1371.
  - Statement on, not allowed, *Mar. 13*, 1211.
  - Supplementary, *Mar. 8*, 723.
    - Notice to be given of, *Mar. 7*, 582; *Mar. 14*, 1371, 1382.

Speaker, —*cont.*
- Strangers' Gallery, Regulations as to Admittance to, *Mar. 10*, 1128.
- Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill—Second Reading—Motion that the Question be now put, *Mar. 10*, 1108.
- Unopposed Returns, Objections to, after Midnight, Disallowed, *Mar. 9*, 1038, 1039.
- Unparliamentary Language, *Mar. 9*, 1014.

Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devonshire, Tavistock].
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 368, 369.

Spencer, Earl
- Cabinet Meetings, Attendance of Minister at, prior to Taking Office and being Sworn of the Privy Council, *Mar. 9*, 863.
- Defence of the Empire, Provisions against Surprise, Invasion, etc., *Mar. 3*, 314–316.
- Indian Forest Service Department, Transfer of, from Cooper's Hill to Oxford University, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 544, 545.
- Military Manoeuvres Bill, *Com. Mar. 9*, 882.
- Navy Estimates, Reduction in, *Mar. 3*, 315.
- Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 14*, 1351.

Spirits
- *See also Names of Spirits.*
- Foreign Duty Paid—Removals in United Kingdom, Check on Statements by Spirit Dealers, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 2*, 185.

Springtown, Granard
- Reilly, Terence, Proposals as to reinstatement of,
  - *Qs.* Mr. Farrell, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 8*, 722.

Standing Committees
- *See under* Committees.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*Postmaster-General*, [Lancashire, Westhoughton]
- Addresses—Regulations as to use of English language and characters, *Mar. 6*, 423–425; *Mar. 8*, 730.
- Dismissal of officials, Regulations as to, *Mar. 8*, 702.
- Ireland.
  - Aghnacliffe Postal Arrangements, Improvement of, *Mar. 14*, 1361.
  - Arklow Postmaster, Appointment of, *Mar. 6*, 425.
  - Armagh—Case of Mr. R. J. M'Cusker, *Mar. 6*, 397.
  - Belfast.
    - Mail Service with London, Improvement of, *Mar. 13*, 1220.
    - Staff, Pay of, *Mar. 2*, 167.

[*cont.*

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Belturbet Postal facilities, Improvement of, *Mar. 13*, 1219.
    - Milltown, Sunday Post to, proposed, *Mar. 9*, 912.
  - Currygranny Postal arrangements, *Mar. 1*, 28.
  - Drogheda and Virginia Road, Improvement of Service between, *Mar. 8*, 728.
  - Dublin.
    - Duties, Allocation of, *Mar. 13*, 1221.
    - North of Ireland, Service to, Improvement in, *Mar. 14*, 1393.
    - Overtime of postmen at Christmas, Payment for, *Mar. 7*, 591, 592.
    - Sorters, Auxiliary, Employment of, *Mar. 7*, 592.
  - Edgeworthstown Parcels delivery arrangements, *Mar. 1*, 28.
  - Glastrigan Postal arrangements, Improvement of, *Mar. 8*, 702.
  - Limerick—Rutland Street Vacancy, Appointment to, *Mar. 13*, 1187.
  - Liscarroll Postal arrangements, Improvement in, *Mar. 14*, 1359.
  - Longford—Postal Service to Elphin, Improvement of, *Mar. 9*, 940.
  - Redford-Moy, Erection of pillar-box at, *Mar. 9*, 910.
- Irish Language, Letters and parcels addressed in, etc.
  - Delay in delivery, Reason for, *Mar. 7*, 591; *Mar. 9*, 939; *Mar. 13*, 1220, 1221.
  - Regulations as to, *Mar. 6*, 423, 424; *Mar; 8*, 729, 730.
- Late-fee letters, Regulation as to posting. in special boxes, *Mar. 9*, 911.
- Learners—Appointments (1902-1904), *Mar. 14*, 1360, 1378.
- London—Ludgate Hill, Risk allowance at, *Mar. 6*, 398.
- Mail Service, Scotland.
  - Night Mail to North of, *Mar. 2*, 165.
  - West Highlands, Improvement in, *Mar. 9*, 923.
- Messengers, Night—Pay, Good Conduct Awards, etc., *Mar. 13*, 1186.
- Packets of printed papers, Regulations as to weighing, etc., *Mar. 3*, 319: *Mar. 10*, 1048, 1049.
- Postmasters.
  - Nationality and Religious Denominations of, *Mar. 8*, 701.
  - Vacancies, Appointments to, in Ireland *Mar. 9*, 940.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont*
- Postmen.
  - Good-conduct Stripes, Forfeited, Rule as to recovery of, *Mar. 8*, 702,
  - Gratuity to, on being incapacitated by an accident—Case of J. Webb, *Mar. 14*, 1362.
  - Overtime in Dublin Office at Christmas, Payment for, *Mar. 7*, 591, 592.
  - Rural, Rate of Payment of, *Mar. 9*, 923.
- Railway Sub-Offices, Municipal Boroughs as, *Mar. 14*, 1361.
- Relatives of Supervising Officers, Employment of, *Mar. 2*, 166,
- Savings Bank.
  - Depositor's Accounts.
    - Explanation of Origin of—Powers of Registrar of Friendly Societies *Mar. 8*, 715; *Mar. 13*, 1205.
    - Inspection of, by the Public, *Mar. 8*, 715; *Mar. 13*. 1206.
  - Deposits, Evasions of Limit of, *Mar. 9*, 922.
- Scotland.
  - Dingwall, Enlarged Accommodation at, proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1207.
  - Inverpolly, Postal Facilities at, Extension of, proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1207
  - Lewis, Island of—Improvement in Postal Arrangements, *Mar, 14*, 1378.
- Sick Leave Regulations—Case of Mr Emberson, *Mar, 8*, 703.
- Telegraph Service.
  - Bath—Grievances of Female Telegraphists, *Mar. 7*, 574.
  - Bristol Superintendentship, Appointment to, *Mar, 9*, 910.
  - Grievances of Employees as to Inducements to Enter the Service, *Mar. 2*, 183.
  - Ireland.
    - Aughnacashel, Establishment of Office at, proposed, *Mar. 8*, 729.
    - Granard Extension, Route of, *Mar. 9*, 938.
    - Limerick—Extension to William Street, *Mar. 13*, 1187.
  - London, Salaries of Telegraphists in.
    - Increase of, proposed, *Mar. 7*, 575.
    - Maximum, *Mar. 7*, 561.
  - Scotland—Interruption in Service to Shetland, *Mar. 2*, 166.
  - Telegrams, Privacy of —Violation of Regulations at Clones, alleged, *Mar. 14*, 1362.
- Telephane Service.
  - Call-boxes, Ventilation of, *Mar. 14*, 1360.

[*cont.*

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*
  Telephone Service—*cont.*
    London, in, Progress made with Establishment of, *Mar. 1*, 18.
    National Telephone Company, Agreement with.
      Discussion of, Opportunity for, *Mar. 14*, 1361.
      Progress of Negotiations with, *Mar. 6*, 409.
      Staffs, Transfer of, *Mar. 13*, 1185.
    Overhead Wires, Danger of, *Mar. 7*, 560.
  Volunteers—Facilities for Camp Leave, *Mar. 8*, 703.
  Wages, Bradford Committee on—Adoption of Report proposed, *Mar. 13*, 1206, 1207.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
  Education—Supply of Teachers, Grants for Pupil Teachers, etc., *Mar. 9*, 891, 897, 900.

Stanmore, Lord
  Military Manœuvres Bill, *Com*, *Mar. 9*, 880.

Stevenson, Mr. F. S. [Suffolk, Eye.]
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Total Administrative Expenses and Income of, 1890–1904, *Mar. 9*, 904.

Stewart, Sir M. J. Mc T. [Kirkcudbright]
  Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill 2R. *Mar. 3*, 372.

Stornoway
  Battery Park — Fishermen's Dwellings, Allocation of Sites for—Progress with Houses.
    Q. Mr. Weir, *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 7*, 578.

Street Betting Bill
  l. Com. and *Rep.*, *Mar. 2*, 159.
    Rep. from Standing Committee,* *Mar. 14*, 1334.
  Debate in Committee [Lords] *Mar. 2*, 159.
    Frequenting, Objections to use of Term, 160, 161.
    Street, Definition of, 159, 160.

Streets and Roads
  Traction Engines on, Damage done by—Prohibition use of Grooved and Corrugated wheels, proposed,
    Q. Mr. Lyell; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 10*, 1050, 1051.

Sugar
  Brussels Convention.
    Appeals, Date of hearing, etc.
      Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 6*, 410.
    German Railways, Freights on—Reductions of rate.
      Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1201.

Sugar—*cont.*
  Colonial Sugar Bounties, Representations as to abolition of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 1*, 12.
  Price—Great Britain and Foreign Countries—Return as to Sugar consumed by working classes, Ordered, *Mar. 9*, 903.
  Russo-German Treaty, Provision of, Assent of Brussels Convention to, etc.
    Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 13*, 1200, 1201.

Sullivan, Mr. D. [Westmeath, S.]
  Athlone Labourers' Cottages Scheme, Decision as to, *Mar. 9*, 909.

Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill
  l. 2R *Mar. 14*, 1334.
  Debate on Second Reading [Lords] *Mar. 14*, 1334.
    Fines proposed to be inflicted, 1335.
    Hairdressers, proposed exemption of, 1346, 1353, 1355.
    Increase in Sunday Trading of recent Years, 1334, 1335, 1343, 1347, 1352
    Inquiry into facts of the Case, proposed, 1348, 1349, 1354.
    Law as to, Laxity in Enforcing, Number of Infringements, etc., 1334, 1336, 1343.
    Local Authorities, Powers granted to, 1335.
    Petition in favour of the Bill, 1334.
    Prohibition of Sunday Trading, 1335.
      Exceptions to, 1335, 1346, 1350, 1351, 1353, 1355.
    Public opinion as to, 1335, 1336, 1339, 1340, 1344, 1345,
    Referring Bill to Select Committee, proposed, 1346, 1348, 1352.
    Shop Assistants, Importance of securing day of rest for, 1338, 1339, 1347, 1350, 1351.
    Sunday Observance, History of, 1341-1343.
    Tobacconists, Proposed exemption of 1335, 1350, 1351, 1353, 1355.
    Trades Associations' support of the Bill, 1337–1339.

Sunderland and South Shields Water Bill
  c. 2R.* *Mar. 6*, 389.

Superannuation
  See under Civil Service.

Supplementary Estimates
  See under Estimates.

Supply
  Army Estimates, *and* Navy Estimates, *see those titles.*

Supply—*cont.*

Expediting, Application of the closure—Resolution (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Mar. 14*, 1396, 1503.

Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 14*, 1395–1397, 1503–1505, 1509; Mr. J. Redmond, 1396, 1397, 1503, 1505; Mr. Bryce, 1395–1397, 1504; Mr. Buchanan, 1396; McCrae, 1397; Mr. Lough, 1397, 1508; Mr. Churchill, 1505; Mr. J. Ellis, 1507; Maj. Seely, 1508; Mr Labouchere, 1509; Mr. J. Walton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1510.

Terms of Resolution.

Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, *Mar. 14*, 1504; Mr. W. Churchill, 1506, 1507; Mr. J. Ellis, 1507; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1510.

Private Member securing place by Ballot for a Motion on going into Supply, Precedence of, over Minister.

Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Mar. 6*, 433, 435; Mr. Speaker, 433–435; Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. G. Bowles, 434; Mr. Lough, 435.

Sutherland

Fishing Industry Inquiry into depression of—Date of Report.

Q. Mr. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar. 2*, 165.

Swine Fever

Ireland, Outbreaks in.

Qs. Mr. Delany, Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *Mar. 2*, 196–198.

Restriction on movement of Swine, Withdrawal of, proposed.

Qs. Mr. Joyce, Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *Mar. 6*, 411, 412.

Regulations, Improvement of.

Q. Mr. Marks; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *Mar. 1*, 4.

Tate Gallery

Lighting of—Provision for Artificial Light proposed.

Q. Col. Stopford-Sackville; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 3*, 317, 318.

Taxation

Growing Burden of.

Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1*, 32.

War Taxes, Continuance of, in times of peace.

Os. Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 1*, 34, 35.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]

Fiscal Policy—Preferential Treatment for Colonies, Food Taxation, etc., *Mar. 8* 816–820.

Taylor, Mr. A.—*cont.*

Merchant Shipping—Foreign Ships, Application of Statutory Powers to—Reappointment of Select Committee, proposed, *Mar. 6*, 410.

Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3*, 330–332.

Telegraph (Construction) Bill

c. 1R*. *Mar. 9*, 947.

Telegraph Service

Bath—Grievances of Female Telegraphists.

Q. Mr. Barlow; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 7*, 574.

Bristol Superintendentship, Appointment to.

Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 910, 911.

Grievances of Employees as to Inducements to enter the Service.

Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 2*, 183.

Ireland:

Aughnacashel, Establishment of Office at, proposed.

Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8*, 728, 729.

Granard Extension, Route of.

Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 938.

Limerick — Extension to William Street.

Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 13*, 1186, 1187.

London, Salary of Telegraphists in.

Increase in, proposed.

Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 7*, 575.

Maximum.

Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 7*, 561.

Messengers, *see under* Post Office.

Norway and Great Britain, between, Agreement as to, Presented, *Mar. 10*, 1047; *Mar. 13*, 1130.

Shetland, Interruption in Service to.

Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 2*, 166.

Telegrams, Privacy of, Regulations as to—Clones Case.

Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1361, 1362

Telephone Service

Call-boxes, Ventilation of.

Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1360.

London System, Progress made with Establishment of.

Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 1*, 18.

National Telephone Company, Agreement with.

Discussion of. Opportunities for.

Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 14*, 1361.

[*cont.*

Telephone Service—*cont.*
  National Telephone Company—*cont.*
    Negotiations with, Progress of.
      Q. Mr. Cohen; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar.* *6*, 409.
    Staff, Transfer of.
      Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar.* *13*, 1185.
  Overhead Wires, Danger from.
    Q. Mr. Martin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar.* *7*, 560.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
  Fire, Protection from, Date of Appointing Committee to consider, *Mar.* *10*, 1051.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
  Coal Mines, Number of Boys employed in, *Mar.* *13*, 1190.

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate
  Sale of.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *2*, 193.

Thompson-Orpen Estate
  Evictions, Disturbances at, Action of Constabulary, etc.
    Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *7*, 580.

Thring, Lord
  Indian Forest Service Department, Transfer of, from Cooper's Hill to University of Oxford, proposed, *Mar.* *7*, 538.

Tibet Expedition
  Rewards for Services — Transport and Special Officers on Lines of Communication, Omission of, alleged.
    Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar.* *9*, 915, 916.
  Treaty.
    Chinese Plenipotentary, Appointment of.
      Qs. Mr. H. Roberts, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr Brodrick. *Mar.* *6*, 406, 407.
      Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar.* *7*, 570.
    Indemnity, Amount of — Period Allowed for Payment.
      Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Mar.* *7*, 570.

Tied Houses Bill
  c. 1R.* *Mar.* *7*, 600.

Tipperary
  Court House, Use of for Social Amusements,
    Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson. *Mar.* *7*, 589.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
  Navy, Flogging of Boys in, *Mar.* *7*, 616, 617.

Tomlinson, Sir W. E. M. [Preston]
  Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R. *Mar.* *10*, 1091, 1092, 1097.

Tonnemore Grazing Farm
  Purchase of, by Commissioners for Reinstatement Purposes, proposed.
    Os. Mr. Farrell, *Mar.* *9*, 961.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* *7*, 587.

Town Holdings Bill
  c. 1R.* *Mar.* *13*, 1230.

Traction Engines
  Damage done to Roads by.
    Grooved and Corrugated Wheels, Prohibiting use of, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Lyell; *A.* Mr. W Long, *Mar.* *10*, 1050, 1051.
    Ireland, Application of Highways and Locomotives Act to.
      Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Speaker, *Mar* *8*, 723.

Trade, Board of
    President—Marquess of Salisbury.
    Secretary—Mr. A. B. Law.
  Constitution of.
    Os. Mr. Soares, *Mar.* *13*, 1287; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1293.
  Labour Department—Annual Abstract of Statistics, Date of publishing.
    Q. Mr. Fenwick; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar.* *9*, 922.
  President of.
    Duties of.
      Os. Mr. Soares, *Mar.* *13*, 1287; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1297.
    Member of House of Commons, Necessity for Appointing, Precedents for appointing Peer, etc.
      Os. Mr. Soares, *Mar.* *13*, 1288–1290; Mr. Trevelyan, 1290, Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1293–1299; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1300–1301; Mr. Marks, 1304–1306; Mr. Bell, 1306.
    Salisbury, Marquess of, Protests against Appointment of.
      Os. Mr. Soares, *Mar.* *13*, 1287–1290; Mr. Trevelyan, 1290–1292; Mr. Purvis, 1292; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1292–1299; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1300-1304; Mr. Marks, 1304–1306; Mr. Bell, 1306.
      Adjournment of the House to discuss.
        Motion [Mr. Soares], *Mar.* *13*, 1230, 1287.
      By-election, Fear of, the real Reason for, alleged.
        Os. Mr. Soares, *Mar.* *13*, 1289; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1293, 1294; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1302, 1303.

Trade Disputes
Royal Commission on—Date of Presenting Report.
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *Mar. 2*, 200, 201.

Trade Marks Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 1*, 147.

Trade Reports
Annual Series, Presented, *Mar. 2*, 150, 164; *Mar.6*, 386, 390; *Mar. 13*, 1130; *Mar. 14*, 1358.
Miscellaneous Series, Presented, *Mar. 9*, 861, 903; *Mar. 14*, 1334, 1358.

Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill
c. 2R., *Mar. 10*, 1054.
Debate on Second Reading [Commons], *Mar. 10*, 1054.
Allen *v.* Flood, Case of, 1055, 1056.
Charnock *v.* Court, Case of, 1061.
"Coercion" of Members of Parliament by the Unions, alleged, 1079, 1080.
Combination, Right of, 1093, 1094. 1104, 1105.
Conciliation, Policy of, 1071, 1072, 1075.
Funds.
Benefit Funds, Separating from other Funds, proposed, 1103.
Liability of, for Acts of Agents, etc., 1059, 1065, 1066, 1082, 1084, 1085, 1087, 1096, 1097, 1099-1104.
Law as to, Interpretation of, Diversity of Decisions given,etc., 1055-1065, 1073, 1076, 1080, 1081, 1085, 1093, 1094, 1098, 1107.
Lyons *v.* Wilkins, Case of, 1055, 1061, 1062, 1087, 1088, 1094, 1095.
Mogul Case, 1063, 1064.
Objections to the Bill, 1082, 1083.
Picketing, Peaceful Persuasion, etc., Law as to, 1055-1065, 1074, 1083, 1084, 1087-1091, 1095, 1105, 1106.
Policy of the Unions, Justification of, 1067-1069, 1071, 1072, 1090, 1098.
Powers of Unions, Extension of, proposed by the Bill, etc., 1078, 1079, 1081, 1091, 1108.
Referring Bill to Select Committee, proposed, 1092, 1097.
Royal Commission.
Constitution of, 1070, 1077, 1092.
Report of, Awaiting, prior to Legislating, 1070, 1077, 1079, 1089, 1091, 1099, 1107.
Status of Unions, 1067, 1086.
Taff Vale Decision, 1081, 1083, 1089, 1096, 1099, 1104.
Referring to Standing Committee on Law, proposed.
Os. Mr. Whittaker, Sir T. Wrightson, *Mar. 10*, 1119; Sir J. Fergusson, 1120; Mr. Hardy, 1121; Col. Pilkington, 1121, 1122.

Tralee
Postmastership, Appointment to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 9*, 939, 940.

Transvaal
Chinese Labour.
British Soldiers employed in suppressing Riots, and bringing back Deserters, alleged.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *Mar. 2*, 243, 253; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 243, 247, 250, 253, 254; Mr. W. Churchill, 247; Dr. Macnamara, 250.
Disturbances.
Method of Dealing with, etc.
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 6*, 392, 393.
Notice of, by Employers.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 2*, 181.
Sentences on Rioters, Information as to.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8*, 710.
Flogging Regulations.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 6*, 393.
Secret Societies or Trade Unions Regulations as to formation of.
O. Mr. K. Hardie, *Mar. 1*, 13.
Qs. Mr. Whitley; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 1*, 13; *Mar. 8*, 707.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 6*, 406.
Skilled Labour, Employment on, alleged—Application of Ordinance to Chinese previously in the Transvaal.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 7*, 569.
Statistics as to.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 2*, 182.
Wages, Rate of.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 14*, 1373, 1374.
Labour Question.
British Central African Natives in Mines,
Information as to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8*, 707.
Chinese Labour, *see that subheading.*
Statistics as to.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 2*, 182.
White and Coloured Labour in July 1899, as to.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 8*, 708.

[*cont*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Labour Question—*cont.*
White Labour.
Decline in, Effect of Chinese Labour on, etc.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar.* 8, 710, 711.
Statistics as to.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar.* 2, 182
Wages, Rate of, in Mines.
Q. Mr. Markham; A. Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar.* 8, 708, 709.
Mines.
Labour in, *see subheadings* Chinese Labour, *and* Labour Question.
Output of Gold in December 1904.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar.* 8, 708.
Premier.
Profits from, in respect to Financial Position of the Colony
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar.* 13, 1183.
Sale of Diamonds—Arrangement with Mr. S. Neumann, alleged.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar.* 13, 1183, 1184.
Order, Maintenance of—Military Aid to Civil Power during past Six Months.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar.* 7, 569.
Representative Institutions for.
Boer Generals, Speeches of—Terms of Treaty of Vereeniging, etc.
Qs. Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar.* 8, 709, 710.
Discussion, Opportunity for.
Q. Mr. Markham; Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* 8, 710.
Powers of Lord Selborne as to.
Qs. Mr. Markham, *Mar.* 6, 495, 498; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 498, 499.
War, Claims in respect of, against Transvaal, irrespective of Promised War Contribution.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar.* 6, 392.
War Contribution.
Conditions of, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar.* 1, 70; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 90.
First Instalment, Date of Payment of.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar.* 1, 71, 72, 73; Mr. McCrae, 77.
War Loan, Conditions of Granting.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, *Mar.* 1, 70–73.

Trawlers Certificates Suspension Bill
Date of Taking.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* 13, 1223, 1224.

Trawling
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Number, Nationalities, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar.* 8, 721.
Norwegian Trawlers Registered in Norway and carrying British Crews—Right to Fish in Territorial Waters, Tabling Correspondence, proposed.
Q. Captain Ellice; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar.* 2, 187.
Scotland—Isle of May—Protection of fisheries.
Q. Capt. Ellice; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *Mar.* 13, 1188.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [York, W.R., Elland]
Somaliland Campaign, Conduct of, *Mar.* 7, 651, 653.
Trade, Board of—Appointment of Lord Salisbury as President, *Mar.* 13, 1290–1292.

Trinity College, Dublin
Tenants, Relations with—Presentation of Committee Report.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 1, 25, 26.

Trustee Savings Banks
See under Savings Banks.

Trustees
Fraudulent — Legislation to prevent Breaches of Trust, proposed.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *Mar.* 1, 6.
Public Trustee and Executor Bill, *see that title.*

Tuberkeen
Ward, Mr. G., Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar.* 14, 1387.

Tuke, Sir J. B. [Edinburgh and St. Andrew's University]
Companies, Registration of—Prevention of evasion of Medical and Dental Acts, *Mar.* 13, 1189; *Mar.* 14, 1363.

Turkey
Customs Duties, Increase in—Application of Surplus to carrying out Reform in Macedonia.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar.* 14, 1375.
Debt Decree of September 1st, 1903, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar.* 6, 427, 428.
European Provinces of, Tabling Correspondence relating to, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar.* 9, 919.

[*cont.*

Turkey—*cont.*
Kuklish, Salonica, Alleged outrage by Turkish Troops at, Information as to.
Q. Sir A. Hayter; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 13,* 1173.
Qs. Mr. H. Smith; *A.* Earl Percy, 1184.

Villages destroyed by Turkish Troops—Number rebuilt.
Q. Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 9,* 920.

Turnour, Lord [Sussex, Horsham]
Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill. 2R. *Mar. 3,* 354.

Tweedmouth, Lord
Military Manœuvres Bill, 2R. *Mar. 2,* 156–158; *Com., Mar. 9,* 879, 883, 885, 886–888.

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 2,* 149.

Ulster and Connaught Light Railways Bill
c. 2R.* *Mar. 13,* 1168.

Unemployed
Causes of Distress.
O. Mr. Guest, *Mar. 1,* 48.

Legislation for, Date of Introduction of.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Mar. 6,* 430.

London Committee, Grant from Imperial Exchequer to, Suggested.
Q. Dr. Macnamarra; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *Mar. 13,* 1174.

Mansion House Committee, Report by, proposed.
Q. Mr. Whitmore; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 9,* 906, 907.

Work for, Suggestions as to.
Qs. Mr. Partington; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Mar. 1,* 7.

Unfunded Debt
See under National Debt.

United States of America
Coal Industry—Report Presented, *Mar. 14,* 1334.

Cuba, Treaty with, Effect of, on British Trade.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 1,* 13, 14.

Navy—Information as to Vessels built and building—Return Ordered, *Mar. 6,* 391.

Trade Report, Annual, Presented, *Mar. 2,* 150.

University College, London (Transfer) Bill
l. 2R.* *Mar. 14,* 1333.

University Colleges
Grant-in-aid—Minutes Presented, *Mar. 8,* 698; *Mar. 9,* 861.

Urban District Councils, Ireland

Meetings, Special, Provision for summoning.
Q. Mr. P. J. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 2,* 174.

Vaccination

Children of School age, Re-vaccination of, Legislation as to, proposed.
Os. Duke of Northumberland, *Mar. 10,* 1042–1044; Lord Kenyon, 1044.

Exemption Certificates—Case of Mr. P. Cook.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas. *Mar. 8,* 716, 717.

Expenses—Committee Report, etc.
Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Mar. 7,* 559.

Presented, *Mar. 8,* 698; *Mar. 9,* 861.

Vaccination Bill
c. 1R.* *Mar. 2,* 205.

Vans
Covered, Accidents with in London—Operation of New Bye-law.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Akers Douglas, *Mar. 1,* 18.

Vincent, Sir E. [Exeter]
Estimates, Committee to Examine and Report on, prior to Discussion, proposed., *Mar. 1,* 52.

Financial Position of the Country, Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 1,* 49–54.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]
Aliens Bill—Date of Introduction, *Mar. 6,* 425.

Bread, Comparative Prices of, 1902–1905, *Mar. 8,* 718.

Colonies.

American Goods, Treaties for Preferential Treatment of, *Mar. 9,* 913.

British Goods, Customs Duties on, *Mar. 8,* 712.

Public Trustee and Executor Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3,* 374.

Trustees, Legislation to prevent Fraud by, proposed, *Mar. 1,* 6.

Volunteers—Resignations and Appointments from October to December, 1903 and 1904, *Mar. 13,* 1196.

Wheat and Flour.

Imports of Wheat in 1903 and 1904, *Mar. 8,* 718.

Registration Fee, Receipts from, on Imports, 1903, *Mar. 8,* 718.

Volunteers

- Fourth West York Artillery, Date of Issue of Field Guns to,
  - *Q.* Mr. S. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 14,* 1366.
- Grants to.
  - Changes proposed in.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* * Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 14,* 1367.
  - Incidence, Changes proposed in.
    - *Q.* Mr. Fuller; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *Mar. 7,* 567.
- Officers, Schools of Instruction for, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Partington; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1197, 1198.
- Post Office—Facilities for Camp Leave.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Mar. 8,* 702, 703.
- Recruiting, etc.—Comparison of 1903 and 1904 (October to December).
  - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1196
- Resignations, October to December, 1903 and 1904.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1196.

Walker and Wallsend Union Gas Bill

- c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 2.

Walton, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley]

- Army.
  - Civilians attached to Units, Pay of, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 287.
  - Expenditure, Reduction in, Necessity for, *Mar. 2,* 252.
  - Regimental Allowances and Expenses, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 281.
  - Reorganisation Proposals, *Mar. 2,* 252.
- Navy Estimates—Vote A, Discussion of Whole Naval Policy on, *Mar. 13,* 1322.
- Somaliland Expedition, Expenditure on Policy of the Government, etc., *Mar. 8,* 790–792.
- Supply, Application of Closure to, *Mar. 14,* 1510.

War Office

- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
- *Under-Secretary*—Earl of Donoughmore.
- *Financial Secretary*—Mr. W. B. Davenport.
- Clerks, Abstractor—Retirement Regulations.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; A. Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 6,* 395, 396.
- Financial Department, Re-organisation of.
  - *O.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 2,* 222.
- Soldiers and Ex-soldiers employed in
  - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1179.
- Staff.
  - *Qs.* Mr. McKenna, *Mar. 2,* 210.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Stafford, Lichfield]

- Army.
  - Reserve, Estimate for, *Mar. 2,* 632, 634.
  - Reduction in Numbers, proposed, *Mar. 2,* 251.
  - Staff.
    - Changes in, proposed, *Mar. 2,* 223.
    - Expenditure for, Increase in, *Mar. 2,* 228.
- Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill, 2R., *Mar. 3,* 380.
- Navy—Works Bill, Information as to, *Mar. 6,* 526.

Warwickshire

- County Court Registrar, Order prohibiting Practice as Solicitor, Presented, *Mar. 8,* 699; *Mar 9,* 862.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]

- Navy—Oil Fuel, Cost of—Comparison with that of Coal, *Mar. 14,* 1422.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]

- Coastguards—Establishment of Station on Sanday Island, proposed, *Mar. 2,* 164.
- Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of.
  - Commission of Inquiry—Details as to Evidence, *Mar. 6,* 393.
    - Native Witnesses, Treatment of, *Mar. 6,* 394, 408.
  - Currie, Rev. W. T., Report of—Presentation proposed, *Mar. 6,* 394.
- Ecclesiastical Buildings in Scotland, Rating of, *Mar. 13,* 1210.
- Estate Duty on Colonial Securities, Prevention of Double Payment of, *Mar. 9,* 903.
- Ibadan, Terms of Holding Land at, *Mar. 2,* 181.
- Lagos Government Inscribed Stock, Security for, *Mar. 13.* 1182.
- Lerwick, Visit of the German Fleet to, *Mar. 6,* 520.
- Motor Traffic, Heavy, Regulations for, in Scotland, *Mar. 2,* 186.
- Navy.
  - Bases.
    - Rosyth—Price paid for Land, *Mar. 6,* 520.
    - Strategic Importance of, *Mar. 6,* 519, 520.
  - Stations.
    - Halifax and Esquimault, at, Handed over to the Canadian Government, Policy of, *Mar. 6,* 520.
    - St. Lucia, Abandonment of Station at, *Mar. 6,* 520.

cont.

Wason, Mr. J. C.—*cont.*
- Navy—*cont.*
  - Wei-hai-wei, Abandonment of, Works at, *Mar. 6,* 519.
- Shetland Telegraph Service, Interruption in, *Mar. 2,* 166.
- Somaliland Expedition — Arming of Natives, *Mar. 14,* 1376.

Waterford
- Horses, Outbreak of Epizootic Lymphangitis among, Steps taken to Check
  - *O.* Mr. Power, *Mar. 8,* 786.
  - Compensation for Destruction of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1219.

Watergrasshill
- Prosecution Case, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 19, 20.

Wei-hai-Wei
- Naval Works at, Abandonment of, alleged
  - *Os.* Mr. Buchanan, *Mar. 6,* 490, 517; Mr. C. Wason, 519; Mr. A. Lee; 526.

Weir, Mr. J. G., [Ross and Cromarty]
- Achintee River, Footbridge Across, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 412.
- Army.
  - Civilians Attached to Units, Pay of, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 292.
  - Highland Regiments, Grouping of Under New Depôt Scheme, *Mar. 8,* 706.
  - Regimental Allowances and Expenses, Increase in Vote for, *Mar. 2,* 281.
- Crofters Act, Extension of, to Leaseholders, *Mar. 1,* 19.
- Congested Districts Board, Scotland.
  - Fishermen, Loans to, proposed, *Mar. 7,* 579.
  - Funds, Augmentation of, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 426, 427.
- Egypt — Mecca Pilgrims — Theft of Charitable Funds, from Mahmal Escort *Mar. 8,* 713.
- Electric Railways.
  - Backworth, Fatality at, *Mar. 1,* 15.
  - North Eastern, Accidents on, etc., *Mar. 14,* 1378.
- Equivalent Grant, Disposal of *Mar. 1,* 19.
- India.
  - Budget, Date of Presenting, *Mar. 2,* 171.
  - Petitions for Redress of Grievances Presented in Parliament, Action taken on, *Mar. 9,* 913.
- Lewis, Island of.
  - Fisheries.
    - Mansfield Commission, Inclusion in Scope of proposed, *Mar. 13,* 1209.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
- Lewis, Island of.—*cont.*
  - Fisheries—*cont*
    - Quantity of Fish landed for years 1901–1904, *Mar. 13,* 1209.
  - Health Officer for, Appointment of, etc., *Mar. 14,* 1384.
  - Ness Harbour—Clearing of sand, proposed, *Mar. 14,* 1383.
  - Postal Arrangements, Improvement in, *Mar. 14,* 1377.
  - Shader Landing Place, Work at, Delay in proceeding with, *Mar. 7,* 579.
- Local Government Board, Scotland—Additional Medical Inspectors, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 412.
- Milk Supply in Scotland—Government inspection of Stock, *Mar. 7,* 579.
- Navy—H.M.S. "Harrier" and "Barham," Speed and Fishery Duties of, *Mar. 6,* 404.
- North Sea.
  - British Trawlers fired on by Baltic Fleet—Result of Inquiry, *Mar. 1,* 18.
  - Fishery Investigations, Vessels employed in, *Mar. 8,* 721.
- Physical Deterioration Committee Recommendations—Issue of Leaflets to Parochial Medical Officers and Poor Law Officers, proposed, *Mar. 6,* 412, *Mar. 7,* 576.
- Post Office.
  - Dingwall, Enlarged Accommodation at, proposed, *Mar. 13,* 1207.
  - Inverpolly, Postal Facilities at, Extension of, proposed, *Mar. 13,* 1207.
  - Learners—Appointments (1902–1904), *Mar. 14,* 1359, 1378.
- Stornoway—Battery Park—Allocation of Sites for Fishermen's Dwellings and Progress with Building, *Mar, 7,* 578.
- Transvaal Labour Question—British Central African Natives in Mines, *Mar. 8,* 707.
- Trawlers, Foreign, in Moray Firth—Number, Nationalities, etc., *Mar. 8,* 721.
- Trawlers' Certificates Suspension Bill Date of Taking, *Mar. 13,* 1223, 1224.
- Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Case of Mr. P. Cook, *Mar. 8,* 716.

Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. [Taunton]
- Army.
  - Lists and Muster Rolls, Old, Conditions of transfer to Public Record Office, *Mar. 9,* 916.
  - Pay, Deferred, Amount of, *Mar. 2,* 261, 262.

[*cont.*

Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E.—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Staff, proposed changes in, *Mar. 2,* 212, 213.
- Defence of the Empire.
  - Home Defence, Force necessary for—Decision of Defence Committee, *Mar. 7,* 595.
  - Invasion or raid, preparedness for, *Mar. 14,* 1393, 1394.
- Division Lobbies, Provision of Extra Exits for, proposed, *Mar. 14,* 1380.
- Ladies' Gallery, Ventilation of, *Mar. 14,* 1380.
- Post Office—Printed Postal Packets, Weighing and Stamping Regulations for, *Mar. 3,* 318; *Mar. 10,* 1048, 1049.

Wellingborough and District Tramroads and Electricity Supply Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *Mar. 13,* 1130.

West Indies
- Garrisons—Decision as to Withdrawal of White Troops.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 6,* 405, 406.
- Telegraph Communication with British Guiana and British Honduras.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 6,* 405, 406.
- Trade of—Effect of Treaty between Cuba and United States.
  - *Qs.* Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 1,* 13, 14.

West Riding of Yorkshire Rivers Bill
- *l.* Order of the Day for 2R., read—not to be further proceeded with, *Mar. 7,* 529.

Western Australia
- Aborigines, Treatment of.
  - *Q.* Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Mar. 1,* 10.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Water and Gas Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *Mar. 2,* 149.

Westmoreland
- Parliamentary Election—New Member Sworn, *Mar. 6,* 432.

Wexford
- Evictions and reinstatements, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1187.

Weybridge and Walton-upon-Thames Electric Supply Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 2.

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Mar. 9,* 862.

Wheat
- Imports—Comparison of 1904 with 1903.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 8,* 718.

Wheat and Flour
- Registration Fee, Receipts from, on Imports, 1903.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Mar. 8,* 718.

Whiskey
- Age Guarantee—Canadian Practice.
  - *Q.* Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Mar. 6,* 408.

Whitchurch (Glos.)
- Rifle Range—Cost, Decision as to Abandonment, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. C. Hobhouse; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 9,* 918, 919.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 352.
- School Attendance—Enforcement of Circular 512, *Mar. 9,* 912.

White Estate, Bantry
- Evicted Tenants, Person Employed to Inquire into Cases of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 1,* 26.

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 2.

Whiteley, Mr. G. [Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey]
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 373.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
- Africa, South, Railways taken over by the Military, Payment for, *Mar. 1,* 16, 17.
- Army.
  - Contract for Forage—Authority for Payment of Compensation, *Mar. 2,* 180.
  - Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory—Reduction in Establishment, *Mar. 14,* 1372.
  - Staff, Expenditure for, Increase in——Dual Appointments, etc., *Mar. 2,* 220.
- Army Estimates—Surpluses on one Vote applied to Reduction on another, Objections to System of, *Mar. 2,* 219, 220, 242.
- Business of the House, Course of, *Mar. 8,* 856.
- Cape Colony Customs Duties—Claim for Rebate on Articles purchased during the War, *Mar. 2,* 176.
- Land Act (Ireland) 1903 Stock, Issue of—Loss on Repayment at par, *Mar. 1,* 16.
- Navy Estimates, Discussion on, *Mar. 13,* 1332.

[*cont.*

Whitley, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*
- Navy—Tubular Boilers, Proportion of Ships fitted with, *Mar. 14,* 1422.
- Norwich Union Life Insurance Society (Stamp Duties) Bill, *Com., Mar. 9,* 901; *Mar. 13,* 1168, 1169.
- Somaliland Expedition, Total Cost of, *Mar. 2,* 180.
- Transvaal.
  - Chinese Labour.
    - British Soldiers Employed in Suppressing Riots, and bringing back Deserters, alleged, *Mar. 2,* 243, 253.
    - Secret Societies, Formation of, *Mar. 1,* 13.
      - Regulations as to, *Mar. 8,* 707.
  - South African War Claims against Transvaal and Orange River Colony, *Mar. 6,* 392.
- Unopposed Returns, Objections to, after Midnight, *Mar. 9,* 1038.
- Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of.
  - Attorney-General, Responsibility of for not setting Public Prosecutor in Motion, *Mar. 9,* 1025.
  - Costs to be Defrayed by the Treasury—Supplementary Estimate for, *Mar. 9,* 1025.

Whitmore, Mr. C. A. [Chelsea]
- Unemployed—Mansion House Committee, Report by, proposed, *Mar. 9,* 906.

Whittaker, Mr. T. P. [York, W.R., Spen Valley]
- Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R. *Mar. 10,* 1054–1069, 1100.
  - Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *Mar. 10,* 1119.

Wigan Corporation Bill
- c. 1R.* *Mar. 2,* 162.
  - 2R*. *Mar. 7,* 553.

Williams, Mr. A. O. [Merionethshire]
- Holyhead Fishermen, Disaster to—Assistance to Families *Mar. 8,* 717.
- Ladies' Gallery—Removal of Grating, proposed, *Mar. 14,* 1381.
- Navy.
  - Rosyth Base, Information as to, *Mar. 7,* 620.
  - Wei-Hai-Wei Works, Abandonment of, *Mar. 7,* 620.

Wilson, Mr. C. H. [Hull, West]
- Shipowners' Negligence Remedies Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 337.

Wilson, Mr. F. W. [Norfolk, Mid]
- Rifle Clubs, Government Assistance to, *Mar. 10,* 1054.

Wilson, Mr. John [Durham, Mid]
- Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R. *Mar. 10,* 1069–1075, 1082, 1100, 1101.

Winchester, Bishop of
- Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill, 2R. *Mar. 14,* 1352.

Winchester, Marquess of
- Military Manœuvres Bill, *Com., Mar. 9,* 876.

Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. [Bath]
- Select Committees on Railway Bills, Appointment of Railway Directors to Act on, *Mar. 14,* 1381.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
- South African War—Stores and Supplies—Deficiency in Weight of Jam supplied, *Mar. 13,* 1181.

Woodville
- Persse, Mr., Investigation of alleged Outrage at House of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 9,* 933, 934.
  - *Qs.* Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Mar. 13,* 1216, 1217.

Woolwich
- Barracks, Works at—Provision for Married Soldiers.
  - *Q.* Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Mar. 13,* 1181.

Women
- Employment of, Before and After Childbirth, Restrictions as to, in Foreign Countries.
  - *Q.* Sir J. Gorst; *A.* Earl Percy, *Mar. 6,* 395.

Workmen's Compensation Act
- Government Employees, Scheme accepted by.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 9,* 905.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Amendment Bill
- c. 1R.* *Mar. 8,* 734.

Works
- Naval, *see under* Navy.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S.—*Temporary, Chairman of Committees* [Sheffield, Hallam]
- Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill, 2R. *Mar. 3,* 364.

Wrexham Gas Bill
- c. 2R.* *Mar. 1,* 2.

Wright, Whitaker, Prosecution of
Attorney-General, Responsibility of, for not setting Public Prosecutor in Motion.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *Mar. 9,* 1025; Sir R. Finlay, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1033; Mr. J. H. Lewis, 1026; Mr. Flynn, 1026, 1027; Mr. Soares, 1027; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1027, 1028; Sir E. Carson, 1028, 1031; Mr. Labouchere, 1028; Mr. J. O'Connor, 1029; Mr. Dalziel, 1030; Mr. J. Devlin, 1031, 1032; Sir A. Rollit, 1034; Mr. S. MacNeill, 1034, 1035; Mr. M'Kenna, 1035; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1036.

Costs to be defrayed by the Treasury—Supplementary Estimate for.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *Mar. 9,* 1025; Sir R. Finlay, 1026, 1033; Mr. Labouchere, 1028; Mr. Dalziel, 1030, 1031, 1033; Mr. V. Cavendish, *Mar. 9,* 1032, 1033, 1036; Mr. W. Churchill, 1033.

Wrightson, Sir T. [St. Pancras, East]
Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, 2R. *Mar. 10,* 1075–1080.
Motion to Commit to Select Committee, *Mar. 10,* 1119.

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A. [Chester]
Navy.
Distribution of the Fleet, Changes in, *Mar. 14,* 1414, 1415.
Gunnery.
Inspector of Target Practice for the Fleet, Appointment of, *Mar. 14,* 1414.
Practice Returns, Improvements in Shooting shown by, *Mar. 14,* 1414.
Personnel, Increasing Efficiency of, *Mar. 14,* 1413.
Preparedness for War, Question as to, *Mar. 14,* 1413.
Reserve Squadron, Maintaining, in Readiness for Action, proposed, *Mar. 14,* 1414.
Shipbuilding Programme, 1905–6, *Mar. 14,* 1416.
Strength of—Comparison with Fleets of Germany, France and United States, *Mar. 14,* 1415.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, West]
Civil Servants, Grievances of, Rule as to Members of Parliament calling Attention to, *Mar. 2,* 167.
Education—Schools—Fees and Restrictions of Free Places, Representation as to, *Mar. 13,* 1209, 1228.